Tully, James. "On Global Citizenship." *On Global Citizenship: James Tully in Dialogue*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014. 3–100. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781472544827.ch-001>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 13:10 UTC.

Copyright © James Tully 2014. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

On Global Citizenship

James Tully

1. Introduction: Global citizenship as negotiated practices

‘Global citizenship’ has emerged as the locus of struggles on the ground and of reflection and contestation in theory.¹ This is scarcely surprising. Many of the central and most enduring struggles in the history of politics have taken place *in* and *over* the language of citizenship and the activities and institutions into which it is woven. One could say that the hopes and dreams and fears and xenophobia of centuries of individual and collective political actors are expressed in the overlapping and conflicting histories of the uses of the language of citizenship, the forms of life in which they have been employed and the locales in which they take place. This motley ensemble of contested languages, activities and institutions constitutes the inherited *field* of citizenship today.²

¹ For an introduction to this broad field see H. Anheier, M. Glasius, M. Kaldor and E. Holland, eds, *Global Civil Society 2004–2005*, London: Sage, 2004; L. Amoore, eds, *The Global Resistance Reader*, London: Routledge, 2005; J. Brodie, ‘Introduction: Globalization and Citizenship beyond the Nation State’, *Citizenship Studies* 8 (4): 323–32, 2004; N. Dower, *An Introduction to Global Citizenship*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003; N. Dower and J. Williams, eds, *Global Citizenship: A Critical Introduction*, New York: Routledge, 2002; D. Held and A. McGrew, eds, *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*, 2nd edn, Cambridge: Polity, 2003; C. McKinnon and I. Hampsher-Monk, eds, *The Demands of Citizenship*, London: Continuum, 2000.

² I mean by ‘field’ the field of human action, the field of academic research and the ecological field in which these are carried on. Similarly, ‘language of citizenship’ refers to the broad range of vocabularies or discourses of citizenship practices, policies and theories.

The language of 'global' and 'globalization' and the activities, institutions and processes to which it refers and in which it is increasingly used, while more recent than citizenship, comprise a similarly central and contested domain. Globalization has become a shared yet disputed vocabulary in terms of which rival interpretations of the ways humans and their habitats are governed globally are presented and disputed in both practice and theory. It thus constitutes a similarly contested *field* of globalization.

When 'globalization' and 'citizenship' are combined they not only bring their contested histories of meanings with them, their conjunction brings into being a complex new field that raises new questions and elicits new answers concerning the meaning of, and relationship between, global governance and global citizenship. When we enquire into global citizenship, therefore, we are already thrown into this remarkably complex inherited field of contested languages, activities, institutions, processes and the environs in which they take place. This conjoint field is the problematization of global citizenship: The way that formerly disparate activities, institutions, processes and languages have been gathered together under the rubric of 'global citizenship', becomes the site of contestation in practice, and formulated as a problem in research, policy and theory, to which diverse solutions are presented and debated.³

The reason why the uses of 'citizenship', 'globalization' and 'global citizenship' are contestable, rather than fixed and determinant, is, as Wittgenstein classically argued, because there is neither an essential set of necessary and sufficient criteria for the correct use of such concepts nor a calculus for their application in particular cases. The art of understanding a concept like 'global citizenship' is *not* the application of a universal rule to particular cases. Rather, the uses of such complex concepts in different cases and contexts do not have one set of properties in common, but – from case to case – an indeterminate

³ For this approach see J. Tully, *Public Philosophy in a New Key*, 2 vols, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, volume I, chapters 1 and 3.

family of overlapping and crisscrossing ‘similarities, relationships, and a whole series of them at that’. What ‘we see’, therefore, is not a single rule (definition or theory) being applied in every case, but, rather, ‘a complicated network of similarities overlapping and crisscrossing: sometimes overall similarities, sometimes similarities of detail’.⁴ A language user learns how to use a concept by apprenticeship in the practice of use and discrimination in everyday life, by invoking (defeasible) similarities and dissimilarities with other cases and responding to counterarguments when challenged, and thereby gradually acquiring the abilities to use language in normative and critical ways in new contexts.⁵

Since the use of concepts with complex histories ‘is not everywhere circumscribed by rules’, Wittgenstein continues, ‘the extension of the concept is *not* closed by a frontier’.⁶ It is almost always possible, to some indeterminate extent, to question a given normal use, invoke slightly different similarities with other historical uses or interpret a shared criterion differently, and argue that the term can be extended in an unexpected and unpredictable way, which is nevertheless ‘related’ to other, familiar uses, and to *act* on it (and sometimes the act *precedes* the argumentation for the novel use).⁷ Use, and therefore meaning, is not the application of a transcendental or official theory of citizenship. It is an indeterminate spatio-temporal ‘negotiated practice’ among partners in relations of dialogical interlocution and practical interaction in which the possibility of going on differently is always present.⁸ This pragmatic linguistic freedom of enunciation and initiation – of contestability and speaking otherwise – within the weighty constraints of the inherited relations of use and meaning is, as we shall see, internally related to

⁴ L. Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1997; for an exploration of this account of learning and understanding language see Tully, *Public Philosophy* I, chapter 2.

⁵ Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, p. 75.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 68.

⁷ *Ibid.*; note also p. 75.

⁸ See J. Medina, *The Unity of Wittgenstein's Philosophy: Necessity, Intelligibility, and Normativity*, Albany: SUNY Press, 2002, pp. 141–94; J. Medina, *Language*, London: Continuum, 2005, pp. 139–67.

a practical (extralinguistic) freedom of enactment and improvization within the inherited relations of power in which the vocabulary is used.⁹ It is the reason why the history of citizens and citizenship is not the unfolding of some transhistorical definition that the grand theories claim it to be. It is not the endless repetition of the same formula, stages of historical development towards a predictable end, an instrument controlled by the hegemonic class or the dialectical overcoming of antagonistic forces. Unfortunately for theorists and fortunately for human beings, it is precisely the unpredictable 'deeds and events we call historical'.¹⁰

The creation of the conjunction 'global citizenship' could be seen as a prime exemplar of the innovative freedom of citizens and non-citizens to contest and initiate something new in the practice of citizenship. The multiplicity of contests that extend citizenship into the field of globalization (conceived formerly as a realm of predictable historical processes impervious to civic action), could be construed as the initiatory act of global citizenship that opens a new field of possibilities of another, more democratic world. While partly true, the actual existing inherited field of global citizenship is much more complex, and the possibilities of initiating and carrying on civic action much more contextually situated within the field, than this abstract formulation could unintentionally lead one to believe. If we wish to become effective global citizens then there is no alternative to undergoing the apprenticeship of learning our way around this complicated field and coming to acquire the practical abilities of thinking and acting within it and the critical abilities of seeing the concrete possibilities of going beyond its limits. This exploration of the field is thus an apprenticeship manual in becoming who we can be – local *and* global citizens.

⁹ This contextual freedom of enunciation and enactment (words and deeds) is an aspect of civic freedom (Subsection 5).

¹⁰ H. Arendt, 'What is Freedom?', in *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977, p. 169; see Tully, *Public Philosophy I*, chapter 4.

2. Two modes of citizenship: Preliminary sketch

Among the many contested meanings and corresponding practices of global citizenship I would like to focus on two and their traditions of interpretation. Many of the most important struggles around the globe today are *over* these two modes of global citizenship and the struggles themselves consist in *their* enactment. Here a 'mode of citizenship' refers to the ensemble comprised of a distinctive language of citizenship and its traditions of interpretation on the one hand and the corresponding practices and institutions to which it refers and in which it is used on the other.¹¹ The two I wish to examine have been interpreted in different ways and related to different traditions of citizenship under different names in a wide variety of academic and activist literature: for example, global citizenship from above *versus* global citizenship from below, low intensity *versus* high intensity global citizenship, representative *versus* direct, hegemonic *versus* counter-hegemonic, cosmopolitan *versus* place-based, universal *versus* multiversal. I call these two families 'modern' and 'diverse' citizenship. I call modern citizenship in a modern state 'civil' citizenship and in a global context 'cosmopolitan' citizenship. The corresponding names of diverse citizenship are 'civic' and 'glocal'. 'Glocal' and 'glocalization' in the diverse citizenship tradition refer to the global networking of local practices of civic citizenship in contrast to the use of 'global' and 'globalization' in modern/cosmopolitan citizenship.¹² The comparative explication of these two historical and contemporary vocabularies and the practices in which they are used aims to bring to light the shared field of citizenship from their different orientations. I begin with a

¹¹ This account of modes of citizenship is adapted from Wittgenstein's concept of language-games and Foucault's concept of practical systems. See Tully, *Public Philosophy* I, chapters 1–3. In these chapters I have used the general category of practices rather than modes. However, in this case, citizenship is taken as a practice in one tradition and an institution in the other, so the use of practice as the generic term would elide this crucial difference.

¹² I am indebted to Warren Magnusson for introducing me to the concept of and literature on glocal citizenship.

preliminary sketch of two general aspects of citizenship as a way of introducing them.¹³

The first and most familiar aspect is that modern citizenship is the modular form of citizenship associated with the historical processes of modernization and colonization: that is, (1) the modernization of the West into modern nation states with representative governments, a system of international law, the decolonization of European empires, supranational regime formations and the development of global civil society; and, in tandem, (2) the dependent modernization and citizenization of the non-West through colonization, the Mandate System, post-decolonization nation-building and global governance of the former colonies. The language of modern citizenship, in its civil and cosmopolitan forms, presents successive idealizations of modern Euroamerican citizenship as the uniquely universal module for all human societies. This allegedly universal mode of citizenship is also presented as the product of universal historical processes or stages of development under successive discourses of progress – civilization, modernization, constitutionalization, democratization and now globalization – that began in Europe and have been spread around the world by Euroamerican expansion and continuing hegemony. These two features of modern citizenship – a universal *institutional* form of citizenship conjoined with a universal set of historical processes that bring it to the non-West under Western tutelage – are articulated and debated in, respectively, modern normative theories of citizenship and social scientific theories of modernization from the eighteenth century to today.

In contrast, diverse citizenship is associated with a diversity or multiplicity of different *practices* of citizenship in the West and non-West. The language of diverse citizenship, both civic and glocal, presents citizenship as a situated or 'local' practice that takes countless forms in different locales. It is not described in terms of universal institutions and historical processes, but in terms of grass roots democratic or civic

¹³ This preliminary sketch is developed in more detail in the following sections and it draws on the chapters in Tully, *Public Philosophy*.

activities of the 'governed' (the people) in the specific relationships of governance in specific locales and the glocal activities of networking with other local practices. Whereas modern citizenship focuses on citizenship as a universalizable legal status underpinned by institutions and processes of rationalization that enable and circumscribe the possibility of civil activity (an institutional/universal orientation), diverse citizenship focuses on the singular civic activities and improvisations of the governed in any practice of government and the diverse ways these are more or less institutionalized or blocked in different contexts (a civic activity/contextual orientation). Citizenship is not a status given by the institutions of the modern constitutional state and international law, but negotiated practices in which one becomes a citizen through participation.

Second, the language of modern citizenship, especially the theories, histories and comparative taxonomies, not only elaborate a theory of modern citizenship with its membership codes, rights and duties and corresponding institutional preconditions, it also characterizes all other practices of citizenship in relation to its unique form as the universal standard. Other modes of citizenship are classified as either not really citizenship at all (not meeting any of the modern criteria) or, if some modern criteria are present, as primitive, pre-modern, traditional or customary stages of proto-citizenship on the historical path (cultural, economic, cognitive, political) to full modern citizenship as the telos, and as requiring some form of direct or indirect guidance from the self-described more advanced, civilized or developed races, nations or peoples. That is, the kind of *critical theory* that has accompanied modern citizenship since the eighteenth century critically organizes all other forms of citizenship in the world as 'lower' or 'inferior' in relationship to its form as the regulative ideal. This feature of the language of modern citizenship is called the 'subalternization' or colonization of other forms of citizenship: bringing them to language under a description of their subalternity or coloniality relative to modern citizenship.¹⁴

¹⁴ W. D. Mignolo, *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges and Border Thinking*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

The language of diverse citizenship, in contrast, characterizes other forms of citizenship as singular and historically contingent and critically compares them in terms of various similar and dissimilar aspects and from the perspectives and normative criteria of each.¹⁵ From these perspectival and critical comparisons, modern citizenship (like all forms of citizenship) is seen as one singular, historical form of citizenship among others, with its strengths and weaknesses relative to others, yet presenting itself in false (circular) claims to universality (formulated in different ways over the last 200 years) that legitimate its global imposition. That is, the kind of *critical attitude* that accompanies practices of diverse citizenship and contextualizes or 'provincializes' modern citizenship and its universalizing language, usually but not necessarily by a historical or genealogical contextualization.¹⁶ The aim of this critical attitude is to free us from the hold of the globally dominant language of modern citizenship as the pre-emptive language of disclosure of all forms of citizenship and enable us to see it as one language among others. In so doing, it de-universalizes modern citizenship (for, as we have seen, its claim to universality is internal to the globally dominant language of modern citizenship) and de-subalternizes other modes of citizenship (discloses them in their local languages and histories). Modern citizenship can thus be put in its place as one singular (and imperious) mode in a global field of diverse alternatives and the critical work of comparisons and contrasts from different perspectives and norms of assessment can begin. This difficult practice of situated critical freedom is not a change in theory but in attitude or ethos – in the way one sees and acts in the world of citizenship and its possibilities.¹⁷

¹⁵ That is, the diverse tradition studies citizenship in the comparative and analogical way Wittgenstein outlines in the Introduction. For these two contrasting genres of reasoning, the modern and the diverse, see Tully, *Public Philosophy* I, chapter 1.

¹⁶ See D. Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000; and D. Chakrabarty, *Habitations of Modernity: Essays in the Wake of Subaltern Studies*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

¹⁷ For the contrast between a 'critical theory' and a 'critical attitude' see Tully, *Public Philosophy* I, chapter 3.

Section One: Modern Citizenship

3. Modern civil citizenship

The tradition of modern citizenship takes as its empirical and normative exemplar the form of citizenship characteristic of the modern nation state.¹⁸ Citizenship (both civil and cosmopolitan) is defined in relation to two clusters of institutional features of modern nation states: the constitutional rule of law (*nomos*) and representative government (*demos*). The constitutional rule of law is the first condition of citizenship. The 'civil' law (a formal legal order) and its enforcement by a coercive authority establishes (literally 'constitutes') the conditions of civilization, the city (*civitas*), citizenship, civil society, civil liberty and civility (hence 'civil' citizenship). By definition the 'outside' is the realm of the uncivilized: barbarism, savagery, the state of nature or war or the uncertainty of informal, customary law and unenforceable natural law. A person has the status of citizenship in virtue of being subject to civil law in two senses: to an established and enforced system of law and to the 'civilizing', pacifying or socializing force of the rule of law on the subjectivity (self-awareness and self-formation) of those who are constrained to obey over time. This is why cosmopolitan citizenship and global civil society depend on some form of legalization or constitutionalization of the global order analogous (in various ways) to the modern nation state.

Relative to the constitutional rule of law, modern citizenship is defined as a status (state or condition). This civil status is usually

¹⁸ For the background to Section Two see J. Tully, *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995 as well as Tully, *Public Philosophy I*, chapter 6, and Tully, *Public Philosophy II*, chapters 1, 2, 4 and 7; C. Tilly, *Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007; D. Held, *Models of Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity, 1996; J. Dunn, *Democracy: A History*, Toronto: Penguin Canada, 2005; M. R. Ishay, *The History of Human Rights: From Ancient Times to the Globalization Era*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004; S. Halperin, *War and Social Change in Modern Europe: The Great Transformation Revisited*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004; Q. Skinner and B. Strth, eds, *States and Citizens: History, Theory, Prospects*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003; E. Wood, *Democracy against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995; and the references in note 1.

explicated and defined in terms of the historical development of four rights (liberties) and duties of formally equal individual subjects of an association of constitutional rule of law and representative government. The association can be either the modern nation state, including its subordinate provinces and cities, or its analogous associations for cosmopolitan citizenship (international law, the United Nations (UN), global governance institutions). I will start with the four tiers of citizenship rights and duties within modern nation states as they are the basis of modern/cosmopolitan global citizenship.

The first and indispensable tier of rights is the set of 'civil liberties' (the liberties of the moderns or private autonomy) of the modern liberal tradition. This set includes the liberty of the person and of speech, thought and faith, the right to own private property and enter into contracts and the right to formal equality before the law. In virtue of these civil liberties citizens are 'at liberty' to engage in these activities if they choose (an opportunity status) and are protected by the law from 'interference' in the spheres where these rights can be exercised: of free speech and voluntary association, the market and the law. They are classic 'negative' liberties, protecting citizens from interference in these spheres.

Civil liberties and the rights of the person thus presuppose and are predicated of a human being with a distinctively modern or 'juridical' form of subjectivity situated in a set of modern institutional and educational preconditions. A modern person must be able to see oneself and others from the 'universal' standpoint of abstraction and freedom from relationships with others and, as such, independent rather than dependent (in relationships with others) or autonomous rather than heteronymous (determined by something other than one's self-legislating will). This modern subjectivity of civil personhood developed historically from the Roman legal dichotomy between the master, who possesses liberty because he is subject to his own will, and the slave, who lacks liberty because he is subject to the will of another. From the standpoint of formal and abstract independence and equality, civil persons are then at liberty to enter into relationships with each

other on the basis of consent and contracts (irrespective of substantive inequalities). These relationships are 'free' relationships because the contracting parties give their consent. The collective analogue is the civil understanding of the right of self-determination of peoples. A people is said to be able to stand back and abstract itself from inherited relationships both among its individual members and between it and other peoples and – in a mythologized, historical constitutional convention or a hypothetical thought experiment – reach agreement on the basic laws they will subject themselves to and the international laws they will enter into with other peoples. In obeying the law, they obey their own will and remain at liberty.

At the centre of these civil liberties is the modern liberty to participate in the private economic sphere and not to be interfered within it; the right to own property and enter into contracts. This is the modern liberty to engage in the capitalist economy (market freedoms and free trade): to sell one's labouring abilities on the market for a wage to a corporation or, for those with the capital, to establish a corporation, hire the labour of and sell products competitively on the free market to consumers. Private corporations in the late nineteenth century gained recognition as 'persons' with the corresponding civil liberty of private autonomy (negative liberty). Thus, paradoxically from a civic perspective, the first right of modern citizenship is to participate in the private realm and to be protected from interference by the citizenry and its representatives. This form of participation in the economic sphere ('commercial society') is primary – *the* liberty of the moderns.

The modern civil liberty of private property and contracts accordingly presupposes the historical dispossession of people from access to land and resources through their local laws and non-capitalist economic organizations; the Enclosure of the commons; the accumulation of dispossessed workers into a 'free' market of wage labourers and consumers; the concentration of the means of production in private corporations and the imposition of modern legal systems of property law, contract law, labour law and trade law that constitute and protect the system of free markets and free trade. Thus, modern citizenship, in its

basic commitment to the civil liberty of private property and contracts, is grounded in and dependent on the spread of these institutions of capitalism.¹⁹ It is also the major justification for the spread of these institutions – as the basis of modern liberty. Accordingly, it is not only the coercive imposition of civil law acting alone that is said to civilize the uncivilized natives. Capitalist ‘commerce’, which, by rendering every person and society economically interdependent and competitive within an imposed structure of law and contractual relationships, pacifies, refines, polishes, makes predictable and – in concert with the law and representative governments – leads a crooked humanity, behind its back and despite its natural asociality, towards perpetual peace.

The second tier of liberties of modern citizenship is defined in relation to the second cluster of modern institutions: representative government. It consists in the rights to participate in these institutions if one chooses. In the language of modern citizenship ‘democracy’ and ‘democratic’ are equated with and restricted to ‘representative government’ and ‘democratization’ with the historical processes that bring these representative institutions and participatory rights into being. Other forms of democracy, if they are discussed *as* democracies, are described and subalternized in relation to representative government as the universal and regulative ideal of democracy. These rights of the modern democratic tradition are called public autonomy or the liberties of the ancients. They comprise the ways the *demos* – the citizenry of a nation state as a whole – legally exercise their popular sovereignty. The exercise of these ‘democratic’ rights enables the people to have a democratic say with respect to the laws and constitutions to which they are subject (and from which their citizenship derives) and thereby to balance the constitutional rule of law with the demands of democracy (the rule of the people) in a modern (representative) form. This representative form of democratic participation is contrasted with direct democracy, which is characterized as an ‘earlier’ form, incompatible with the size, complexity

¹⁹ This summary draws on both Adam Smith and Karl Marx on what they called ‘primitive accumulation’. See K. Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Volume I, London: Penguin Classics, 1990, pp. 873–940. For the recent literature see note 18.

and individual liberties of modern polities. Modern democratic rights include: the right to vote for representatives in elections, join parties, interest groups, non-governmental organizations and social movements, stand for election, assemble, dissent and demonstrate in the civil or public sphere, freedom of the (private) press, engage in democratic deliberations, litigate in the Courts, exchange public reasons over ratifying constitutional amendments or participate in a constituent assembly and engage in civil disobedience and accept the punishment.

Like civil liberties and their institutional preconditions, these democratic liberties presuppose historically the dispossession of people from access to political power through pre-existing local forms of citizenship and the channelling of democratic citizenship into participation in the official public sphere of modern, Western representative governments and their global analogues. These historical 'processes' are described as freeing people from pre-modern forms of subjection and bringing democratic citizenship to them. Participation is equated with activities of public arguing (deliberating), bargaining (organizing, negotiating and protesting) and litigating over changing the laws, since political power, the object of democratic participation, is presumed to be exercised through the rule of law. The aim is to ensure that the law is not imposed unilaterally on those subject to it, but that they may, if they choose, have a representative say in making or amending the laws, and thus see themselves, abstractly and representatively, as co-articulators of the laws. This form of participation thus takes place (in both practice and theory) within and reproduces the ground plan of modern citizenship because the people participate *as* juridical citizens exercising democratic rights within modern institutions and under the priority of first tier civil liberties.²⁰

²⁰ This juridical framework of individual democratic participation also enframes the modern collective right of self-determination in which a people have the right to form a modern state with the characteristic institutions and within the international state system (or, if they are a people within a modern state, then they must determine themselves within the constitutional constraints of that state – 'internal' self-determination). See Subsection 4 as well as Tully, *Public Philosophy* I, chapter 8, and *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 5.

The second tier democratic liberties are circumscribed by the first tier civil liberties in three main ways. Their exercise is optional. Members of a modern political association are citizens and the association is democratic whether or not they exercise their participatory rights. To make participation a requirement of citizenship is to violate the civil liberty not to be interfered with and thus is inconsistent with modern liberty. Second, the primary use and justification of these rights in the modern tradition is to fight for laws that protect the private autonomy of the moderns from too much governmental interference or domination – to protect the private liberty of the modern individual. Third, these rights cannot be extended and exercised in the private sphere (as in economic democracy in the workplace) for this would interfere with tier one liberties. When the leaders of the great powers today (the G8) speak of the spread of ‘freedom’ and ‘democracy’ in Afghanistan, Iraq and elsewhere in sound bites, they are referring to the module of tier one (freedom) and tier two (democracy) rights of citizenship and their underlying institutions of the rule of law, markets, eventual representative government and the military as the imposition and enforcement institution.

The third and weakest tier of modern rights of citizenship comprises the social and economic rights of the modern social democratic tradition. These are the citizenship rights won over the last two centuries by working-class movements struggling within the historically established priority and constraints of tiers one and two liberties in nation states and international law. They are a response to the horrendous, substantive inequalities in wealth, well-being, living conditions and forms of social power that go along with the unrestrained formal independence and equality of first tier civil liberties and the limited democratic rights of the second tier. The modern social democratic argument for them is that they are the minimum conditions of the worst off actually being able to exercise their civil and democratic liberties.²¹ The argument

²¹ The substantive inequalities across class, gender, race, ethnicity, regions and the North and Global South open up an enormous gap between the formal possession of a legal right and the actual wherewithal to exercise it effectively, yet the possession of the right is often equated with ‘being able to’ exercise it or being ‘at liberty’ to exercise it, thereby eliding this de facto disenfranchisement of millions of human beings.

against them is that they violate the economic liberties of the moderns by interfering in the private sphere and economic competition, and thus must be subordinated to tier one civil liberty and the limits of tier two. When the capitalist countries triumphed over the socialist countries at the end of the Cold War the bargaining power of Western socialist and social democratic movements was undermined and neoliberal governments were able to dismantle many hard-won social and economic rights nationally and internationally in the name of spreading market freedoms and democratic freedoms.

The fourth tier of citizenship rights consists of modern minority rights of multiculturalism, religious and ethnic groups, multiple nations within states and indigenous peoples. These rights appear to some modern theorists to violate one premise of modern citizenship, the primacy of the individual legal subject. However, minority rights can be defined as rights that, first, protect the individual members of minorities from interference or dominance by the majority (and by the powerful within the minority) and, second, empower members of minorities to exercise their civil and democratic liberties in more effective ways than through the institutions of the majority society. They thus can be designed to enhance, rather than to challenge, the spread of modern citizenship. This is the major way they have been implemented within modern nation states and international law. That is, they too presuppose the dispossession of 'minorities' of their diverse forms of legal, governmental and economic organization and their integration into replication forms of modern citizenship.

Within Europe, this modular form of modern citizenship became paramount during the centralization and consolidation of the modern constitutional representative nation state and the capitalist economy. Diverse local and regional forms of laws, governments and citizenship – of village commons, urban communes, counties, regional leagues – where they were not destroyed completely, were marginalized or transformed and subordinated as they were brought under the rationalization of the central institutions of the modern nation state. Modern citizenship was nationalized as local citizenship was subalternized. Generations of 'locals'

were gradually socialized by education, urbanization, military duty, industrialization and techniques of citizenization to see themselves first and foremost as members of an abstract and disembedded imaginary community of nation, *demos* and *nomos* of formally equal citizens. In virtue of possessing the individual liberties of modern citizenship attached to the central legal and representative institutions, they were encouraged to see themselves as participating in a similarly abstract imaginary of the sovereignty of the people. The violent dispossessions and transformations, and the countless civic resistances to them, were described and justified in the social-scientific and normative theories and traditions of modern, state-centred citizenship as processes of modernization and making the modern identity. These ‘uneven’ processes are said to free individuals from dependency on unfree pre-modern ways and progressively make him and then her free and equal citizens with four tiers of rights and duties, correlative to the four aspects of a fully modern identity, and with the corresponding differentiation of institutionalized value spheres in which to exercise them.

Citizens and especially non-citizens – such as the poor, the propertyless, women, immigrants, excluded ‘races’ and others – struggled and continue to struggle within and against these ‘civilizing processes’ in Europe. When they were not struggling for local forms of self-government, they fought to be included in modern citizenship, to extend the use of political rights beyond the official public sphere, to gain social and economic rights that do more than prepare one for the market and for minority rights that protect alternative cultural, legal, political and economic organization. These struggles were and are against the powerful actors who strive to circumscribe citizenship to tier one civil liberties and a limited module of democratic rights.²² Since these types of struggle are *for* new kinds of citizenship and by means of people who are not official citizens, or official citizens who often act beyond the official limits of citizenship of their generation, they cannot be called practices of citizenship in the modern tradition. They

²² Ishay, *History of Human Rights*, pp. 63–244.

are classified as acts of civil disobedience or rebellion. If these illegal struggles are successful and the extensions institutionalized, then the extensions are redescribed retrospectively as stages in the development of modern citizenship and incorporated within its framework, as in the cases of working-class struggles giving rise to social and economic rights, women gaining recognition as citizens, civil rights movements and recognition of cultural minorities. Thus, what are seen as activities *of* citizenship by the civic tradition – struggles for new forms of recognition and extensions of citizenship – fall outside of modern citizenship with its institutional/status orientation.

4. The globalization of civil and cosmopolitan citizenship

I want now to examine how the modular form of modern citizenship has been spread around the globe as ‘global citizenship’. It has been and continues to be globalized in two forms. First, the tripartite module of a modern nation state, the underlying institutions that modern citizenship presupposes, and, once these preconditions are in place, the specific institutions of modern *civil* citizenship has been and continues to be spread around the world, as various stages of development, as the universal form of political association recognized as the bearer of fully legitimate political authority (sovereignty) under international law. Second, a modular form of modern *cosmopolitan* citizenship has been and continues to be spread as the universal form of global citizenship recognized as legitimate under international law and global institutions.²³

During the long period when Europeans were building modern nation states with the underlying institutions of modern citizenship they were also, and simultaneously, building these states as competing *imperial* modern nation states. As imperial states they built and

²³ Subsection 4 is based on the detailed studies and references to the scholarly literature in Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapters 1, 4, 5 and 7. I have not repeated all these references here except for a few cases.

defended vast overseas empires that colonized (in various ways) 85 per cent of the world's population by 1914. The imperial 'great game' of competing economically and militarily against other great European powers over the control and exploitation of the resources, labour and markets of the non-European world *and* the counter-actions of the non-European peoples co-created the modern West and the modern colonized non-West. After decolonization, this great game continues, between the former imperial powers (renamed the 'great eight'), exercising 'hegemony' rather than 'imperium' through the post-World War II Bretton Woods institutions of global governance, and over the renamed 'post-colonial' world of more than 120 nominally free and equal (sovereign), yet substantively still dependent and unequal, new modernizing nation states, constructed on the foundations of the former colonies and protectorates. The spread of modern citizenship and its institutional preconditions beyond Europe can be understood only in the context of this immensely complex contrapuntal ensemble of Western strategies of expansion and non-Western strategies of counteraction, and the effects of their interaction over the last half millennium.

The module of institutional preconditions of modern citizenship was implanted abroad, in the course of European expansion, by a deceptively innocuous apparatus that linked a right of global citizenship to imperial power in a circular relationship. Formulated and exercised in different ways by the different European powers in the early modern period, the imperial right of cosmopolitan citizenship for Europeans is called the right of commerce (*ius commercium*) or 'cosmopolitan' right. From the earliest phase of European expansion under Portugal and Spain to the present day the great powers have claimed the cosmopolitan right of their citizens, trading companies, monopoly companies and multinational corporations to travel to other countries and attempt to engage in 'commerce' in two early-modern senses of this term. The first is to travel the globe freely and converse with the inhabitants of other societies. This covers such activities as the right – and duty – of Western

explorers, missionaries, religious organizations, voluntary associations and academics to travel to non-Western countries in order to, first, study and classify their different customs and ways into developmental stages of different societies and races, and, second, try to free them from their uncivilized ways and teach them the uniquely civilized ways of the West. This cosmopolitan right is the historical antecedent of the right of modern cosmopolitan citizenship of civil society associations (modern Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs)) to modernize and democratize people in the post-colonial world today. The second sense of this cosmopolitan right is to travel and attempt to engage in 'commerce' (trade) with the inhabitants. This includes such commercial activities as entering into contracts and treaties, gaining access to resources, buying slaves, hiring and disciplining labourers, establishing trading posts, making investments, establishing plantations and so on. At first it was used by the European powers to establish imperial monopolies over the exploitation of the resources and labour of non-European societies, but monopoly imperialism gradually gave way to 'free trade' or 'open door' imperialism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

This cosmopolitan right correlates with the duty of 'hospitality' of the host country to open their doors to free commerce in this dual sense. If they inhospitably close the door to entry, break the contract or expropriate the property of a foreigner who has engaged in commerce, or if they expel the missionaries and voluntary societies, then the appropriate recognized legal authority – under the old law of nations, or imperial law of the respective empire or, later, international law – has a reciprocal right to open the door by diplomacy or military intervention (gunboat diplomacy), punish the violation of the cosmopolitan right and demand reparations or compensation. The correlative duty of hospitality – openness to free commerce – holds even if the cosmopolitan right was initially exercised unjustly: that is where a trading company used force and fraud to establish trade relations and contracts in the first place. The early-modern duty of non-European societies to open their resources to commerce dominated by

the West continues to be one of the core duties of transnational trade law agreements today.

As with civil liberty within a modern state, this cosmopolitan right presupposes a number of institutions. The host country must have or adopt the legal, economic and cultural institutions that make possible commerce in this broad sense (private property, foreign corporations, contracts, wage labour, dependence on the international market dominated by the West, openness to cultural conversion, protection of foreigners and so on). The imperial power must either submit to and modify the local laws and institutions or impose a structure of commercial law that overrides and restructures them, such as Merchant's Law (*lex mercatoria*), the vast global system of trade law that developed in conjunction with Western imperialism.

We can see that this cosmopolitan right is a right of citizens of the civilized imperial states to exercise the first right of modern citizenship (civil liberties of private autonomy) and a version of the second right (to participate) beyond their nation state and to be protected from interference in doing so. The two rights – of the trading company to trade and the voluntary organizations to converse and convert – also fit together in the same way as within the nation state. The participatory right to converse with and try to convert the natives complements the primary right of commerce since the inhabitants are taught the requisite forms of subjectivity and modes of civil conduct that go along with the commercialization of their society and its gradual civilization. The discipline of slavery and indentured labour on the plantations, the various forms of religious and occupational education and the military and civil training of dependent elites at the top were seen as steps in the civilizing process. From the modern perspective, these two rights of cosmopolitan citizenship linked to imperial power appear to bring the gift of the civilizing institutions of law, commerce and Western civility to a closed, uncivilized or semi-civilized world, gradually removing all 'savage' (insubordinate) alterity and remaking it as the subordinate image of the modern West. From the perspective of non-Western civilizations and diverse citizenship

this 'cosmopolitan' apparatus of free trade appears as the Trojan horse of Western imperialism.²⁴

In practice, this apparatus was employed to globalize the underlying institutions of modern citizenship in three main strategies. First, settler colonies were established that *replicated* the basic legal, political and economic institutions of the imperial country in the Americas, Australia and New Zealand. The settlement of these 'new Europes' involved the dispossession of the indigenous peoples of their diverse civilizations, territories and resources, the genocide of 80 to 90 per cent of the population, the marginalization of those they could not enslave or assimilate (ethnocide), the transportation of 12 million Africans as slaves to plantations in the Americas and the imposition of Western institutions of property and rudimentary representative government (colonial legislatures). The colonies gained independence from their empires by revolution or devolution and developed the institutions of modern civil citizenship in ways similar to Europe.²⁵ After World War II they developed modern minority rights in domestic and international law as a tactic of 'internal colonization' in response to the continuing struggles of 300 million indigenous peoples for their unceded sovereignty over their traditional territories; the very territories over which these modern states claim to exercise unquestionable sovereignty.

Second, 'indirect' imperial rule opened non-Western societies to commerce by establishing a small colonial administration, often run by trading companies, to rule indirectly over a much larger indigenous population. A centralized system of Western colonial law was used to protect the commercial rights of their citizens and traders, while also preserving and modifying the local customary laws and governments so resources and labour were privatized and subject to trade, labour discipline and investment dominated by the Western trading companies. Local rulers were recognized as quasi-sovereigns in their

²⁴ See especially A. Anghie, *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007; and D. B. Abernathy, *The Dynamics of Global Dominance: European Overseas Empires, 1415–1980*, Yale: Yale University Press, 2000.

²⁵ As in Subsection 3.

regions and unequal treaties were negotiated. The local elites were made dependent on Western economic and military power, undermining their accountability to local citizens, and were employed to introduce modernizing techniques of governance and train the local army to protect the system of property, often against the majority of their own population. This was the main way the institutional preconditions of modern citizenship (and actual modern citizenship for European colonials) were introduced in India, Ceylon, Africa and the Middle East in the twentieth century.

The third and most recent strategy is informal or free trade imperialism. Here the imperial power permits local self-rule, and eventually self-determination, but within a protectorate or sphere of influence over which they exercise informal 'paramountcy' (now called hegemony and dominance). By informal means they induce the local governments to open their resources, labour and markets to free trade and liberalization by establishing the appropriate modern institutions. These provide the foundations for eventual modern citizenship with tier-one market liberties preceding and circumscribing the others. The means include: structural dependency on economic, military, technological and educational aid; the modernization of the population by Western experts and civil society organizations; bribes and threats; training and arming local militaries and counter-insurgency units (death squads) and low-intensity military interventions. This in turn requires small but effective military bases strategically located around the world, linked together by a global navy and (since World War II) air force. These bases, originally coaling stations for the British navy, are used to arm and train the local militias or to intervene whenever local citizens try to take control of their own economic and political affairs and thereby violate their duty of openness to free trade.

This strategy of informal intervention imperialism was developed by the British in the nineteenth century. However, it is the United States that has taken the global lead, first in Latin America under the Monroe Doctrine and then throughout the world by the end of the Cold War. Beginning with over 5,000 interventions in sovereign Latin

American countries in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and the establishment of military/training bases such as Guantanamo Bay (1901), the United States now has over 760 bases beyond its state borders. These are connected by a network of navy, air force, satellite systems and the weaponization of space that continuously surveils and patrols the planet. Similar to the pro-consuls of the Roman Empire and the governors-general of the British, the whole world is divided into four regions under the command of four regional Commanders in Chiefs (CINCs) who report directly to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. According to the Pentagon, this worldwide military empire exercises 'full spectrum dominance' over the informal global system of 'open commerce and freedom'.²⁶

The cosmopolitan apparatus and its three strategies were gathered together and formalized as the 'standard of civilization' in the creation of modern international law during the nineteenth century. The European imperial nation states (and the United States after 1895) declared themselves to be 'civilized states' in virtue of their institutions of modern statehood and citizenship (the modern rule of law, openness to commerce, representative government and modern liberty were the main criteria). As such they were the sole bearers of sovereignty and subject only to the laws they could agree to among themselves, which they called modern 'international' laws. Their modern institutions provided a standard of civilization in international law by which they judged all other civilizations in the world as 'uncivilized' to varying degrees (depending on their stage of development) and thus not sovereign subjects of international law, but subjects of the sovereign imperial powers through colonies, indirect protectorates and informal

²⁶ Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Joint Vision 2010*, available at: www.dtic.mil/jv2010/jvpub.htm (Accessed 19 September 2007). See the discussion and references in Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 5, especially A. Bacevich, *American Empire: The Realities and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002. For the most recent account see G. Grandin, *Empire's Workshop: Latin America, the United States and the Rise of the New Imperialism*, New York: Metropolitan Books, 2007. The classic is E. Galeano, *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent*, New York: Monthly Review, 1997. See Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 5.

spheres of influence.²⁷ They asserted a right and duty of civilization under international law. 'Civilization' referred to both the historical processes of modernization and the normative end-point of a modern civil state. The duty to civilize consisted in the consolidation and international legalization of the imperial strategies they began in the earlier period. The opening of non-European societies to European-dominated commerce and property law, the exploitation of their resources and labour and the removal of uncivilized customs that blocked progress were seen as the first steps of the civilizing mission. The second and equally important duty was to introduce into the colonies and protectorates more systematic and effective forms of colonial governance (or governmentality) that would shape and form the dependent peoples and races into civilized subjects eventually capable of modern self-government.

This global civilizing project under international law lacked an enforcement mechanism and the civilizing duty was left to the sovereign empires and their voluntary organizations. The destruction, exploitation, oppression, despotism, genocide and wars of imperialism and anti-imperial resistance continued apace. They increased after the failure of the Berlin Conference (1884) and the 'scramble for Africa', cumulating in the barbarism of World War I – the 'great war of civilization'. In response to these horrors and to contain increasing demands for decolonization, the first concerted attempt to operationalize the civilizing duty under international law was set up under the Mandate System of the League of Nations. The League classified the subject peoples into three categories according to their aptitude for tutelage in modern citizenship and gave the respective imperial powers the mandate to civilize them as they increased their economic exploitation, especially in the oil-rich Middle East.²⁸

²⁷ The classification of non-Western societies followed the subalternizing logic mentioned in Subsection 2.

²⁸ Middle Eastern peoples were classified as capable of modern self-government and citizenship after a period of 'tutelage', tropical Africans after a longer and more despotic period of 'guardianship' and South Western Africans, Pacific Islanders and Indigenous peoples were classified as too 'primitive' ever to be civilized. See Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 5.

This citizenizing project was interrupted by the decolonization movements of the mid-century. Although the overwhelming majority of people fought for freedom from imperial dependency on the West or the Soviet Union and for their own modes of government and citizenship, the Westernized and nationalizing elites (subject to intensified economic and military dependency) and the informal means of the great powers brought about the continuity of the imperial processes of development. During the Cold War and post-independence state formation in conditions of neocolonial dependency, the nation-building elites were constrained to destroy or subordinate local economies and governments, enforce the artificial colonial boundaries, centralize government, open their resources to free trade, accept constitutions designed by experts from the imperial metropolises and promise minimal institutions of modern citizenship, or face sanctions and military intervention. The result tended to be constitutional and institutional structures that either concentrated power at the centre or, as in Africa, in both the urban and rural regions, replicating the worst features of colonial administration in both types of the case.²⁹

During the same period, the cooperating great powers set up the institutions of global governance through which informal imperial hegemony and post-colonial subalternity could be continued. These are the concentrations of power in the permanent members of the Security Council of the UN, the World Bank (WB), International Monetary Fund (IMF), General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), the World Trade Organization (WTO) after 1995 and its transnational trade agreements (such as TRIPS and GATTs), modernizing NGOs, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and, emerging as the indispensable leader and guarantor after 1989, the United States with its global system of military dominance.

²⁹ M. Mamdani, *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995. And for a comparative survey of constitutionalization since World War II, M. Schor, 'Mapping Comparative Judicial Review', *Comparative Research in Law and Political Economy Research Paper Series* 3 (4): 545–67, 2007. Available at: www.comparativeresearch.net.

At the request of the newly independent states, the language of civilization was removed from international law and the UN.³⁰ However, it was immediately replaced with the language of modernization, marketization, democratization and globalization with the identical grammatical structure, signifying universal processes of development and a single endpoint of modern citizenship and its institutions, and ranks all alternatives in relation to its regulative ideal. These processes are now to be brought about, not by a civilizing mission, but by the 'global governance' of the informal coalitions of the modern (or post-modern) states and their multinational corporations imposing 'good governance' through the global institutions (WB and IMF), and by modern NGOs building civil societies and making civil subjects in the less-developed states. This is all backed up by the US military networks and alliances, for, as its neo-imperial proponents forthrightly explain, the 'hidden hand' of the market, given its intolerable exploitations and inequalities, always needs to be protected by the 'hidden fist' of the military, and the 'savage wars of peace'.³¹ As the leaders of decolonization movements recognized shortly after independence, they were conscripted into an all-too-familiar script, but now in a new language of an abstract modern world system of free and equal nation states and global governance that was said to have come into being in 1648 (the Westphalian System), thereby concealing the imperial construction of this world and its persisting relationships of dependency, inequality and exploitation.

The difference from the old colonial strategies of spreading modern citizenship is that the formerly colonized peoples are now seen as active, self-governing agents in these processes at home and in the institutions of global governance (the G120). They are now bearers of modern civil and cosmopolitan citizenship, yet still under the

³⁰ See Anghie, *Imperialism*, pp. 196–235; and Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 5. However, a reference to the authority of the 'general principles of law recognised by the civilized nations' appears in International Court of Justice, *Statute of the International Court of Justice*, §38.1.c., available at: www.icj-cij.org/documents/index.php?p1=4&p2=2&p3=0 (Accessed 30 July 2007).

³¹ The 'hidden hand' and the 'hidden fist' are from T. Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, New York: Farrar, Strauss, Giroux, 1999, cited in M. Boot, *Savage Wars of Peace*, New York: Basic Books, 2003, p. xx.

enlightened leadership of the more advanced or developed peoples. International law provides the basis for this by promoting a 'right to democracy'. Democracy and democratization projects are equated with tier-one civil liberties (neoliberal marketization) and a short list of democratic rights (primarily elections). However, if citizens become too democratic and seek to exercise their right of self-determination by taking democratic control of their own government and economy, and thus violate their duty to open their doors to the global economy and its laws, multinational corporations and democratization from above, one of two strategies follow. They are repressed by their own dependent elites, democratic rights are further reduced or eliminated and the governments become more authoritarian. Or, if the people manage to gain power, the repertoire of covert and overt informal means available to the great powers are employed to destabilize and undermine the government, bring about regime change and institute neoliberal structural adjustment policies that promote tier-one civil liberties of individuals and corporations. As in the colonial period, the imposition of market discipline is said to come first and lay the foundation for democratic rights. The result in either case is the suppression or severe restriction of democratic citizenship, the corresponding rise of militarized rule and market freedoms on one side and increasingly violent and authoritarian resistance movements on the other. The countries that are subject to these horrendous oscillations are described as 'failed' or 'terrorist' states, covert or overt military intervention follows, resistance intensifies and instability persists.³²

³² The recent 'War on Terror' can thus be seen as the continuation of a much longer trend as many scholars have argued. See Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapters 5 and 7; R. Khalidi, *Resurrecting Empire: Western Footprints and America's Perilous Path in the Middle East*, Boston: Beacon, 2004; and R. Skidelsky, *The Prince of the Marshes and other Occupational Hazards of a Year in Iraq*, London: Harcourt, 2006, for the continuity with earlier British indirect rule in the Middle East. T. Smith, *A Pact with the Devil: Washington's Bid for World Supremacy and the Betrayal of the American Promise*, London: Routledge, 2007, for its continuity with Wilsonian intervention imperialism; Grandin, *Empire's Workshop*, for its continuity with US imperialism in Latin America and Anghie, *Imperialism*, for its longer continuity. Osama bin Laden also places the rise of Al-Qaeda in the broad historical context of Muslim resistance to Western imperialism: O. bin Laden, *Messages to the World: The Statements of Osama bin Laden*, London: Verso, 2005.

The consequence is that a restricted or 'low intensity' form of modern civil citizenship is promoted or promised at the national level with an equally low intensity form of modern cosmopolitan citizenship of individuals and NGOs at the international level. The first wave of international human rights after World War II sought to give protection to the individual person from the worst effects of these processes (civil liberties) and to elaborate a set of global democratic, social and economic and minority rights similar to those at the national level. However, these are hostage to implementation by nation states and thus subject to the processes described above. The second wave of international law brought into force a vast array of transnational trade law regimes (under GATT and the WTO) that override national constitutions and constrain the weaker and poorer countries (which contain the majority of the world's population) to open their economies to exploitation and pollution dumping in order to gain loans, aid and debt relief. The third wave of international law after the Al-Qaeda attack on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon of 9/11/2001 consists of Resolutions of the Security Council of the UN promoting international security. These global securitization regimes, which protect the security and liberty of modern citizens, often override the first-wave international human rights, force national governments to enact security legislation that rolls back hard won democratic rights, thereby circumscribing democratic opposition to the War on Terror and neoliberal globalization, and securing civil and cosmopolitan market liberties of individual and corporate citizens in national and transnational law.³³

This new articulation of the old cosmopolitan Trojan horse is now the major justification for the continuation of Western informal imperialism, as we see in Iraq and Afghanistan today. The opposition parties on the left criticize neoliberal and neoconservative policies and offer a more social democratic and multilateral alternative strategy,

³³ For these three waves of International law, see Ishay, *History of Human Rights*, pp. 173–356; K. L. Scheppele, *The International State of Emergency: Challenges to Constitutionalism after September 11*, Unpublished Manuscript: Princeton University, 2007; and Tully, *Public Philosophy II*, chapter 7.

yet they do so entirely within the shared languages and institutions of modern citizenship. The result is not only continued popular resistance, escalating militarization, and instability, as above, but escalating global inequalities between the West and the non-West that are worse now than at the height of the ruthless phase of Western imperialism at the turn of the nineteenth century.

Approximately 840 million people are malnourished. There are 6 million children under the age of 5 who die each year as a consequence of malnutrition. Roughly, 1.2 billion people live on less than \$1 a day and half the world's population lives on less than \$2 a day. Ninety-one out of every 1,000 children in the developing world die before 5 years old. Twelve million die annually from lack of water, and 1.1 billion people have no access to clean water. About 2.4 billion people live without proper sanitation, while 40 million live with AIDS and 113 million children have no basic education. One in five does not survive past 40 years of age. Of the one billion non-literate adults, two-thirds are women and 98 per cent live in the developing world. In the least developed countries, 45 per cent of the children do not attend school. In countries with a literacy rate of less than 55 per cent, the per capita income is about \$600.

In contrast, the wealth of the richest 1 per cent of the world is equal to that of the poorest 57 per cent. The assets of the 200 richest people are worth more than the total income of 41 per cent of the world's people. Three families alone have a combined wealth of \$135 billion. This equals the annual income of 600 million people living in the world's poorest countries. The richest 20 per cent of the world's population receive 150 times the wealth of the poorest 20 per cent. In 1960, the share of the global income of the bottom 20 per cent was 2.3 per cent. By 1991, this had fallen to 1.4 per cent. The richest fifth of the world's people consume 45 per cent of the world's meat and fish; the poorest fifth consume 5 per cent. The richest fifth consume 58 per cent of total energy, the poorest fifth less than 4 per cent. The richest fifth have 75 per cent of all telephones, the poorest fifth 1.5 per cent. The richest fifth own 87 per cent of the world's vehicles, the poorest fifth less

than 1 per cent.³⁴ As a result of the globalization of modern citizenship and its underlying institutions, the majority of the world's population of landless labourers is thus at liberty to exercise their modern freedom in the growing sweatshops and slums of the planet.³⁵

We can see that the globalization of modern citizenship has not tended to democracy, equality, independence and peace, as its justificatory theories proclaim, but to informal imperialism, inequality, dependence and war. This tendency is intrinsic to the modern mode of citizenship as a whole. From within its institutions, modern citizens see their citizenship as universal, superior and what everyone else would assent to if they were only freed from their particular and inferior ways. Accordingly, they see themselves as having the cosmopolitan right and duty to enter into other societies to free them from these inferior ways, impose the institutional preconditions of modern citizenship, which bring obscene profits to their corporations and unconscionable inequality to the people they are modernizing, and remove the obstacles and resistances to progress. The background languages of universal and necessary modernization and of universal and obligatory norms and institutions of the four tiers of modern citizenship that they project over the global field render the whole ensemble self-validating in theory and practice. In carrying it forward modern citizens are only doing what is both inevitable and right. When others resist, this proves that they are not yet fully civil and rational and legitimates the use of more coercion in response, thereby creating the conditions of its validation and expansion.

From the perspective of diverse citizenship, this mode of citizenship is neither freedom nor democracy but 500 years of relentless 'tyranny' against local citizenship and self-reliance. It is the undemocratic imposition of a low-intensity mode of citizenship over others, in which the people imposed upon have little or no effective democratic say as

³⁴ J. Seabrook, *The No-Nonsense Guide to World Poverty*, Toronto: New Internationalist, 2003, p. 53. See Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 7. For the measurement of global inequalities, see B. Milanovic, *Worlds Apart: Measuring International and Global Inequality*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

³⁵ M. Davis, *A Planet of Slums*, London: Verso, 2005.

citizens, and under which they are not free and equal peoples but subjects of imperial relationships of inequality, dependency and exploitation.

Section Two: Diverse Citizenship

5. Diverse civic citizenship

I now want to move around and survey the same contested field of global citizenship from the orientation and practices of the other, diverse mode of citizenship. To begin this difficult movement I start from a brief synopsis of the globally predominant modern mode of citizenship we examined in Section One. I then show how diverse citizens apply their critical attitude to free themselves from taking its language as the comprehensive language of citizenship and thus enable us to move around to see the field of citizenship and the place of modern citizenship within it from the comparative perspectives provided by other discursive languages of citizenship.³⁶

Synoptically, modern citizenship is a status consisting of four ranked tiers of rights and duties that make sense and are exercised within a canonical set of underlying legal, political, economic, educational and military institutions of the modern nation state, international law and global governance. Modern citizenship is presented as the institutionalization of civil liberty or freedom (freedoms of the person and the market) and democracy (representative government and participation in the public sphere). It is universal in virtue of three constitutive languages: world-historical processes of modernization that bring these institutions into being through stages; the normative ideal of modern citizenship and its institutions presented as the universal form of citizenship for every human being and as the telos of the causal processes and the comprehensive disclosure and ranking of all other

³⁶ Subsection 4 draws on the detailed discussion of the civic tradition in all the chapters in Tully, *Public Philosophy* I–II.

modes of citizenship as either not really citizenship or historically and culturally inferior relative to modern citizenship. Because it is the universal form and as the Western states are closer to realizing its ideal form (more developed), they have a right and duty to bring its underlying institutions, beginning with tier-one institutions, to the less-developed by means of the 'civilizing apparatus' and its many strategies. They also have the duty to defend this unfinished project against those who fail to conform, for it is the mode of citizenship everyone would assent to if and when they exchange public reasons and reach agreement within the universal civil institutions of modern citizenship.

The discussion and criticism of citizenship takes place within these background languages of disclosure of the field of citizenship and the corresponding modern institutions. Questions of citizenship always lead back to the juridical subject with rights and underlying institutions, the social scientific theories of historical processes that bring them about and the normative theories of its ideal universal form and justifications for its globalization. As it is spread around the globe this particular world picture in all its complexity becomes the living identity of modern citizens and of those who see themselves as on their way to becoming modern. It is difficult to free moderns from this world picture, for it lies in the languages they use and the globalized institutions in which they use them and project them over others. One thinks that one is thinking and acting critically with respect to the very essence of citizenship, yet one is predicating over and over again the modern representation of citizenship onto the field of citizenship.

Members of the tradition of diverse citizenship see this self-described universalism and cosmopolitanism as one of the most dangerous forms of circular parochialism and fear of alterity. It appears as the prejudice of taking one's familiar form of national citizenship as the only acceptable form, projecting its hierarchical classifications over others, and trying to make them over in one's own parochial image, with the disastrous effects we have surveyed. How, then, do diverse citizens avoid being taken in by this captivating world picture, exercise their critical attitude on it and sustain a multiplicity of alternative

forms of citizenship, thereby making the actual contrapuntal global field of citizenship qualitatively different from the subordinate mirror image of themselves that the modern mode of citizenship presents to its captivated citizens? I think the answer is a practical one. They avoid assimilation and sustain alternative worlds by *acting* otherwise – by participating in other practices of citizenship (often in the same institutions). I will try to elucidate these alternatives by comparing and contrasting diverse civic citizenship with modern civil citizenship in this section and diverse glocal citizenship with modern cosmopolitan citizenship in Subsection 6. Many of the aspects of civic citizenship are aspects of glocal citizenship as well.

1. The first and fundamental difference between the two traditions is their basic orientation. Rather than looking on citizenship as a status within an institutional framework backed up by world-historical processes and universal norms, the diverse tradition looks on citizenship as *negotiated practices*, as praxis – as actors and activities in contexts. Civic activities – what citizens do and the ways they do them – can be more or less institutionalized and rationalized (in countless forms), but this is secondary. The primary thing is the concrete games of citizenship and the ways they are played.³⁷ The modern tradition in social science and political theory overlooks these activities because it presupposes that the rights, rules, institutions and processes must be primary (the conditions of civilization) and human actors and activities secondary (what happens within the civil space constituted by the civilizing rights, institutions, rules and processes). The diverse tradition reverses this modernist, institutional orientation and takes the orientation of citizens in civic activities in the habitats they are enacted and carried on. Institutionalization is seen and analysed as coming into being in unpredictable and open-ended ways out of, and in interaction

³⁷ As I intimated in the Introduction, my formulations of several aspects of civic citizenship, including this one, draw on Wittgenstein's complementary work on explicating language from the perspective of the activities of language users in the *Philosophical Investigations*. His central insight that it 'is our *acting*, which lies at the bottom of the language game' is at one with the civic orientation (L. Wittgenstein, *On Certainty*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1969, p. 204).

with, the praxis of citizens – sometimes furthering, strengthening and formalizing these activities while at other times dispossessing, channelling, dominating, cancelling, downsizing, constraining and limiting.

Civic citizenship does not take a ‘practice’ of civic activity as a *form* of organization within which civic activity takes place, for this would be to treat civic activity as resting on some proto-institutional background (rules, conditions, processes). Rather, civic citizenship consists of *negotiated* practices all the way down. It comprises civic activities and the ongoing contestation and negotiation of these practices by the participants and by those subject to and affected by but yet excluded from them, and so on in turn. There is never the last voice or word. The form of a civic practice is never closed by a frontier but always open to negotiation. The skills of civic citizenship consist not only in learning how to play by the given rules of a civic practice but also on how to enunciate a critical question about the rules (and their theoretical justifications) and to listen attentively for voices that are silenced or misrepresented by the official rules or the most powerful critics. These ongoing negotiations of practices of civic citizenship are themselves activities of civic citizenship that keep the internal organization of civic activities open and democratic. As we saw in the Introduction, this is just to acknowledge and build into the practice of citizenship a repressible yet irreducible feature of it.³⁸

2. The second way the diverse tradition avoids the prejudice of mistaking one institutionalized form of citizenship as the model for all possible forms is to take any specific civic activity in context as one local negotiated practice of citizenship among many. The way diverse citizens do this is by always keeping the multiplicity of games of citizenship in view (even within their own civic organizations). This enables them to resist (and refute) the temptation to generalize or universalize from a small number of cases and the corresponding contempt for the particular case. They can thus avoid (and deflate) universalizing

³⁸ See Tully, *Public Philosophy* I, chapters 6 and 9 for how this is being done.

questions like ‘What is citizenship?’ and the presumption that there must be one general answer; usually, as we have seen, simply the projection of one’s own familiar example. They take any example of citizenship – no matter how universal or global its own language of self-description and justification claims to be – *as an example*, a particular and local form of citizenship in its environs (as I have tried to do for modern citizenship). In contrast to the universalizing rationalities of modern citizenship, diverse citizens employ contextual and comparative genres of reasoning (Subsection 1). They start from the local languages and negotiated practices of citizens on location and compare and contrast their similarities and dissimilarities with each other from various standpoints, either by engaging in other forms of citizenship or by civic dialogues among diverse citizens. There is thus no comprehensive and universal language of citizenship that defines all others in relation to one ideal form, but, rather, a multiplicity of criss-crossing and overlapping partial and always-incomplete languages of similarities and dissimilarities woven into their practices, employed for various purposes and of which the language of modern citizenship can be seen to be one singular example masquerading as being comprehensive. By these situated alternative means, genres of comparative reasoning and critical dialogues citizens disclose the civic world as a diverse multiverse, and their civic attitude is one of diversity awareness.³⁹

3. Since civic activities are primary, people do not become civic citizens in virtue of a status defined by rights and guaranteed by the institutions of the constitutional rule of law. From the civic perspective, civil citizenship indicates that one is a ‘subject’ of a system of laws and a ‘member’ of that association. Rather, agents (individual or collective) *become* civic citizens only in virtue of actual participation in civic activities. It is only through apprenticing in citizenship practices that one comes to acquire the characteristics of a citizen: linguistic and non-linguistic abilities, modes of conduct and

³⁹ For this mode of reasoning together, see Tully, *Public Philosophy* I, chapter 2, and for its history see Tully, *Strange Multiplicity*.

interaction in relationships with others, forms of awareness of self and other, use of equipment, the abilities of questioning and negotiating any of these features and of carrying on in new and creative ways. This distinction between citizenship as primarily an institutional status and as a negotiated practice is made in a number of different ways. Let me mention three.

The most familiar way is the linguistic distinction between 'civil' (law-based) and 'civic' (activity-based). Whereas civil citizens have the legally guaranteed opportunity to participate in the civil sphere if they chose, civic citizens engage in and experience 'civics' – the activities and practical *arts* of becoming and being a citizen, referred to as 'civicism'. Civic citizenry are not seen as the bearers of civil rights and duties but of the abilities, competences, character and conduct acquired in participation, referred to as 'civic virtues'.⁴⁰ Civil citizens are civilized by the institutional rule of law, commerce and anonymous processes of civilization, whereas civic citizens criticize and reject this disempowering picture that conceals the real world of histories of civic struggles. They 'civicize' themselves. They transform themselves into citizens and their institutions into civic spaces and free 'cities' by civic activities and the arts of citizenship, whether or not these activities are guaranteed by the rule of law or informal customs, or neither. Civic citizenship is not brought into the world by coercion, the institutions of law, the nation state or international law, but by citizens engaging in civic activities and creating civic worlds. As a consequence, participation in civic activities cannot be a duty enforced

⁴⁰ It is tempting to say that tier two rights of participation of civil citizenship might be thought of as 'equipment' for a certain type of civic citizenship (in the civil sphere of modern states and global civil sphere), and so they overlap to this extent. But, even here, this is not completely accurate, as you can have these rights and not be able to exercise them for all sorts of reasons (financial constraints, time constraints, lack of knowledge, fear of consequences, etc.) and thus not even reach the stage of developing the corresponding abilities through practice. And, of course, this particular equipment, as important as it is, is not necessary for participation, since millions participated and continue to participate in civic struggles for rights of this kind and for extending them without having them. Rights are neither necessary nor sufficient conditions of citizenship.

by a coercive authority, for this would be to put a civil institution prior to civic activities.⁴¹

One of the oldest distinctions is between ‘libertas’ – liberty and liberties – of civil citizens and ‘freedom’ of civic citizens. It is impossible to predicate ‘liberty’ of human action (‘liberty action’ makes no sense). Rather, the formal grammar of ‘liberty’ refers to a condition of being ‘at liberty’ (not under the will of another) that a subject has thanks to a law. The civil citizen is at liberty *to* participate or not as he or she wills. In contrast, the informal vernacular term ‘freedom’ (freo, das Frye) is predicated primarily of agents, action, activities and fields of activity throughout its long history.⁴² The civic citizen manifests the freedom *of* participation. The free citizen is free in engaging in civic activities and, *eo ipso*, making these activities free. Civic freedom is not an opportunity but a manifestation; neither freedom *from* nor freedom *to* (which are often absent or suppressed), but freedoms *of* and *in* participation, and *with* fellow citizens. The civic citizen is not the citizen of an institution (a nation state or international law) but the free citizen of the ‘free city’: that is, *any* kind of civic world or democratic ‘sphere’ that comes into being and is reciprocally held aloft by the civic freedom of its citizens, from the smallest *deme* or commune to global federations. It is not a matter of official civil liberties and offices being open to participation, as civil theorists construe a free city, but of the citizenry *experiencing* the civic way of life that makes it a free city, including engaging in opening offices in the first place, as the civic theorists characterize it. Hence, the civic tradition finds one exemplar in the experience of Athenian

⁴¹ I thus see the coerced duty to participate as an (optional) instrument of the civil tradition and incompatible with the civic, although some theorists who are classified as civic have seen it otherwise (see below). My understanding of these two intertwined traditions is indebted to the invaluable scholarship of John Pocock and Quentin Skinner and the wealth of study their work has inspired. For recent reflections, see A. Brett and J. Tully, eds, *Rethinking the Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

⁴² H. Pitkin, *Wittgenstein and Justice: On the Significance of Ludwig Wittgenstein for Social and Political Thought*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973, pp. 10–11; and H. Pitkin, ‘Are Freedom and Liberty Twins?’, *Political Theory* 16 (4): 523–52, 1988. This distinction is at the heart of Arendt’s history of freedom (see volume I, chapter 4).

democracy as a civic way of life reciprocally sustained by democratic citizenship as the freedom of participation (*isegoria*).⁴³

Finally, the priority of civic activities to civil institutions is marked by one of the enduring conventions of Western law. This is the convention that long use (*usus*) and practice brings into the being the ‘right’ (*ius*) to engage in that activity, not vice versa. This is true not only of the origin of common and private property and of the rule of law itself but also of the right of people to govern themselves over a territory. This right of self-government – the very normativity we are trying to understand – comes from citizens governing themselves over a long period of time and being acknowledged by others. This sturdy structure of normativity is so indestructible that even conquest and usurpation by the most institutionalized imperial states in the world cannot extinguish it unless the citizens and descendants either consent to surrender the right (i.e. another citizen activity) or entirely give up *all* the activities of governing themselves after generations of repressive and assimilative occupation (which rarely happens).⁴⁴ Institutionalized rights come into being from the practice of corresponding activities and are continued and guaranteed in the final analysis by the ongoing activities. This is precisely the civic view of the relation between citizenship activities and citizenship rights.⁴⁵ As we have seen in Section One, the civil tradition reversed this orientation, for reasons we will see below (aspect ten).

Of course there is a Western tradition that also places a high value on civic activity but presupposes that it has to take place within a canonical institutional setting. The institutions of the Greek polis, the Renaissance city-state and the modern nation state are standardly taken as the institutional preconditions. This tradition can be seen as ‘civic’ in a narrow or circumscribed sense in contrast to the broad and extended sense that I am explicating. However, it also can be interpreted as a democratic wing of the civil tradition, since it takes an institutional

⁴³ For this interpretation of Athenian democracy, see M. I. Finley, *Democracy Ancient and Modern*, London: Hogarth, 1985.

⁴⁴ See Tully *Public Philosophy* I, chapter 8.

⁴⁵ See Tully, *Strange Multiplicity* for this convention.

form as primary and necessary, differing only over the importance of democratic participation (tier- two rights). Consequently it shares the civil tradition's commitment to the coercive imposition of institutional preconditions and myths of founding.⁴⁶ This latter interpretation thus seems more apt, since this tradition contradicts the primacy of practice and the commitment to a plurality of forms of political organization of the civic tradition (aspects one and two). As we proceed we will see that such attempts to circumscribe civic activity in canonical institutions are continuously undone by the democratic activities of civic citizens and the institutions reformed by the activities.

4. Whereas civil citizenship always exists in institutions, civic citizenship always exists in relationships. There are of two general kinds of civic being-with relationships: (1) relationships among roughly equal citizens exercising power together in citizen–citizen relationships of solidarity, civic friendship and mutual aid (citizen relationships); and (2) relationships between citizens and governors (citizen/governance relationships). To see the importance of this aspect we have to set aside the dominant institutional language of the civil tradition (constitutions, rights, autonomous rules, jurisdiction, states and sovereignty) and look at what goes on before, within, beyond and often in tension with these institutions. What we see are individual and collective actors in citizen and citizen/governance relationships. I will treat citizen/governance relationships first, in which civic citizenship is the vis-à-vis of government, and then turn to citizen relationships (aspect eleven).

The language of relationships between governors and the governed (the people) developed alongside the juridical and institutional language of modern citizenship in Europe as a way of describing government from a more practical and interactive perspective (in contrast to the institutional language of sovereignty, rule and obedience), yet still from the perspective of the governing class.⁴⁷ That is, it characterizes the citizenry in the first instance as the subject and object of the arts and

⁴⁶ This is the tradition mentioned above that often endorses a coerced duty to participate.

⁴⁷ See Tully, *Public Philosophy* I, chapter 3, and *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 2 for the language of governors and governed.

sciences of government, namely, as 'the governed' (or 'all affected'). In the early modern period, the language of governor-governed was used very broadly to characterize any relationship of power and authority in which one actor seeks to govern – to guide – the conduct of another actor: parents-children, master-slave, master-servant, company-employees, sergeant-soldier, teacher-pupil, government-people, colonial administration-colonies, priest-flock, master-apprentice, protégé-mentor, older and younger friends, dance partners and an individual governing his or her own thoughts, desires, will and comportment. Since the phenomena of some agents 'guiding' the actions of others in all these vastly different ways are co-extensive with living in society and interacting with others, relationships of governing and being governed were taken to be the basic unit of analysis, beneath, within and beyond the more formal institutionalization and rationalization of these relationships in the centralizing institutions of modern European societies.

As the modern nation state consolidated and brought many relationships of governance under its direct or indirect auspices, the terms 'government' and 'the governed' came to be restricted to the formal institutions of 'representative government' and its civil citizens in the official public sphere. Modern political science and theory restricted its focus to these institutions, as we have seen, leaving the other relationships of governance in the official private sphere to other specialized disciplines. However, since our conduct is governed in a multiplicity of overlapping ways in contemporary societies and global networks that do not all pass through legal and political institutions, the language of governance in its broad sense has been rediscovered and used anew to analyse in detail the actual workings of contemporary relationships of power, knowledge and subjectification by the governmentality and 'global governance' schools (among others). These two schools can analyse anything from the most specific forms of face-to-face power relationships or the ways media conglomerates govern our thoughts and desires in detail to the most general modes of informal power through which multinational corporations and

coalitions of great powers informally govern the conduct of subaltern states and populations in relation to production, consumption and the environment, through global relationships that bypass, outrun or manipulate traditional legal and political institutions. No matter how anonymous these relationships may appear, especially from an institutional perspective, and no matter how clever those responsible are in evading their responsibility, a relationship of governance can almost always be traced back to identifiable agents who govern (directly or indirectly) on one side and agents who are governed on the other (as environmental movements have shown time after time).⁴⁸

Civic citizens share the view that humans are always already in relationships and that *many* are relationships of this general governance kind (in both its restricted and broad sense). However, while all relationships can be said to 'guide' the partners in some way or another, only a large subset of these can be characterized as 'governing' the partners, in the sense of 'directing', in some more or less calculated way.⁴⁹ They also realize that the practical arts and sciences of government (restricted and broad) consist in a wide variety of knowledges, means and strategies. The bodies of knowledge under which people are picked out and governed comprise the range of human, environmental, policy and administrative sciences that modern governments and governing organizations in the private sphere employ to govern their members, 'all affected' and their relationships with each other. The means can range from the mobilization of the consent of the governed on one side to the use or threat of violence and force on the other. The strategies can range from the most detailed governance of individual preference and character formation through techniques of consultation and deliberation to the global use of sanctions, financial manipulation and military manoeuvres. However, this is where the civic school parts company with the governmentality and global governance schools.

⁴⁸ I discuss these two schools in Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapters 2 and 4.

⁴⁹ Citizen relationships, for example, guide but do not govern (see below under aspect 11). Relationships of love and of friendship are other examples, even though they can involve episodes of governing one another.

Civic citizens rotate the whole orientation around the axis of their real need and examine governance relationships from the standpoint of the partner who is governed – not *as* a governed subject but *as* an agent, a civic citizen.

5. Accordingly, the fifth aspect is the characterization of governance relationships as relationships between citizens and governors. At the heart of any governance relationship and constantly animating it is the freedom of the governed *as* citizens. A relationship of governance does not act directly on the body or mind of the governed, determining the behaviour in detail (or it would be a relationship of force and determination). Rather, it acts on and conducts the ‘conduct’ of the governed partners (their actions, thoughts, expectations, comportment) to induce them to acquire a predictable form of subjectivity (to become self-governing subjects in the relationship). In this sense, governance always presupposes and acts on subjects who are ‘free’. That is, they are individual or collective agents who are faced with a limited field of possible ways of thinking, speaking, acting, organizing and conducting themselves *within* the (rules of the) relationship, including the many arts of appearing to conform while acting otherwise within. And, second, if they refuse to be governed in this way and work within the relationship, there is also a range of possible ways of directly confronting and negotiating the limits of the relationship itself, from the acceptable procedures of grievance and negotiation, strike and direct action to strategies of disobedience, revolt and revolution or escape. The aim of governance is to try to guide (induce, disallow, anticipate and respond to) the freedom of the governed in their activities so they disclose and act on the field of possibilities open to them in predictable, utile and productive ways.⁵⁰

Freedom in the field of a relationship – *Spielraum* or free play – is both the existential field – the room or space of manoeuvrability

⁵⁰ This specific description of situated freedom in governance relationships draws partially on the late Foucault, who introduced it into his own work only in 1980. See Tully, *Public Philosophy* I, chapter 3. My development of it departs from Foucault in a number of ways.

(the range of possible moves) – and the experiential ways the partners can and do disclose and act on their possibilities – the games (*Spiel*) they play *in* the relationship or in the confrontation of its limits. This twofold freedom is the ‘field freedom’ of human beings insofar as they are ‘field beings’ in relationships. ‘Field’ refers to both the broad sense introduced in the Introduction and the primary sense of the field in the natural world where freedom takes place. It is irreducible, exists and is enacted to widely varying degrees in different relationships.⁵¹ It exists in the playful ‘guidance’ relationship between parent and child long before language acquisition, between pupil and teacher in pedagogical relationships, in linguistic relationships,⁵² to a narrow degree in tightly governed institutions (prisons) and more broadly in informal imperial relationships. The governed partner is thus always an active agent – an apprentice player who must learn how to navigate and negotiate his or her way around the field and how to play the game through acting and interacting with the governing partner. The governor is always an interactive partner to some extent, drawn into the game of giving further instructions, answering questions, correcting conduct, responding to seemingly untoward rule following and so on. Humans are always unavoidably *homo ludens*, creative game players and prototypical civic citizens in the dialogical relationships of their cultures and civilizations before and *as* they take on any other identities.⁵³

Since the ‘governed’ in any relationship are always already active agents partaking in guiding and being guided in countless ways, they have to engage in practices of self-formation by which they develop the abilities to act and interact in the relationship. These embodied or

⁵¹ This way of describing freedom in a field draws on Maurice Merleau Ponty. An influential use of *Spielraum* in a somewhat similar way is M. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, New York: Harper and Row, 1962, p. 185 (I.5.31). However, I have learned more from Martin Buber’s innovative attempts to place this field freedom in dialogical relationships and link it to a concrete global politics of non-violence and peace, as I am trying to do as well. See M. Buber, *I and Thou*, New York: Scribner, 1970 and M. Buber, *Between Man and Man*, London: Routledge, 2002.

⁵² As we saw in the Introduction.

⁵³ J. Huizinga, *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture*, Boston: Beacon, 1955; J. Carse, *Finite and Infinite Games: A Vision of Life as Play and Possibility*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1986. See Tully, *Public Philosophy* I, chapter 4.

phenomenological abilities of knowing how to mutually acknowledge and interact with self and others in intersubjective relationships begin to develop in the earliest days of childhood, long before language use and training for specific roles. Apprentices for specific roles usually initially engage in these practices under the direction of the governing partner or peers, and then gradually develop the abilities to perform the role self-critically, creatively and without further direction, but never without further negotiation. One does not become a practitioner blindly. The requisite abilities are acquired in pre-linguistic interaction and by more or less elaborate and reflective practices of the self and on the self in the course of learning one's way around in a specific relationship. Language-learners and novitiate students, for example, gradually become self-critical and self-educating language-users and competent students, each with their own individual and distinctive style, through years of study, practices and exercises of self-formation. The explicit practices of self-formation in any relationship and the more general phenomenological practices that underlie these are the basis for the whole array of more complicated practices of self-formation of civic citizens in citizen/governance and citizen relationships.⁵⁴

No matter how relentlessly domineering governors try to implant and internalize these role-related abilities without the active interplay of the patients, as if they are blank tablets, in behavioural modification experiments, repetitious advertising and total institutions of colonial and post-colonial discipline (such as internment camps and residential schools), they invariably fail to 'construct' the other all the way down. They cannot completely eliminate the interactive and open-ended freedom *of* and *in* the relationship or the room to appear to conform to the public script while thinking and acting otherwise, without

⁵⁴ For background embodied phenomenological dispositions and their development into abilities pre-reflectively and reflectively, see J. Searle, *The Construction of Social Reality*, New York: Free Press, 1995; S. Gallagher, *How the Body Shapes the Mind*, Oxford: Clarendon, 2005; Medina, *Language*; M. Foucault, *Hermeneutics of the Subject: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1981–1982*, New York: Palgrave, 2005; H. O'Grady, *Woman's Relationship with Herself: Gender, Foucault and Therapy*, London: Routledge, 2005 and Tully, *Public Philosophy I*, chapter 2.

reducing the relationship to one of complete immobilization. As we have seen, they are reduced to trying to induce and then respond to and work on the ways the governed conduct themselves in the sparsely limited Spielraum open to them. This is the constrained space in which indigenous peoples and others have exercised the arts of resistance and survived centuries of imperialization.⁵⁵

If, therefore, we analyse a governance relationship from the side of the governed as the citizenry, we can see that the free play of negotiation in relationships is the ground of the civic freedom that manifests itself in civic activities and to which governments respond. So, a relationship of governance is always a relationship of prototypical civic citizenship negotiation to some degree, from the side of the governed. It is not a phenomenon of unilateral control of the conduct of the other, but a much more complicated and open-ended game of interplay and interaction between the arts and practices of proto-citizens and governors. While governors, by their free actions try to structure the field of possible actions of the governed, the governed, by their actions and insofar as they are citizens, try to govern or, rather, 'citize' the actions of their governors. If a defining characteristic of governance relationships is the 'conduct of conduct', it must always be read contrapuntally: as governors and citizens reciprocally conducting the conduct of each other and being conducted by their ongoing interaction in and over the relationships between them.

6. I am saying that we are always and everywhere proto-civic citizens, engaged in practices of negotiating the fields of possibilities in the relationships in which we find our feet and learn to walk. This overlooked everyday, grass roots world of proto-civic freedom in which the official and more familiar activities of citizenship are nurtured and grow is perhaps the greatest discovery of civic practice and philosophy. It

⁵⁵ See J. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*, Yale: Yale University Press, 1990; Tully, *Public Philosophy* I, chapters 7 and 8, and Subsection 6. For the counter-argument that humans are constructed all the way down in power relations and the difficulties in accounting for critical freedom on this view, see Hoy, *Critical Resistance*. It is perhaps noteworthy that several of the authors Hoy discusses moved to a view closer to the one advanced here.

is first and foremost a discovery of feminist movements and of feminists reflecting on this experience in a number of different disciplines. They have transformed the civic tradition.⁵⁶

To survey the field of civic citizenship practices we need to differentiate different types of cases that evolve out of this broad and so far undifferentiated field of proto-civic activities and cross the threshold to civic activities of civic citizens. I want to say that there is no single answer to the question of what makes negotiation in a governance relationship 'civics', the negotiators 'citizens' and transforms the governance relationship into a citizen/governance relationship (or a citizen relationship). Rather, there are family resemblances among cases that give us good but not incontestable reasons for calling a particular case 'civic'. These similarities and dissimilarities relate to: the nature of the activities, the locations they take place, the specificity of citizen relationships, the goods for the sake of which the activities are undertaken, the relationship of the activities to the natural world and the means employed. I will now take up each of these in turn in the following aspects.⁵⁷

For our purpose of introducing the field of civic (and glocal) citizenship by beginning with activities, we can disclose the field under four general types of civic activities. The first is the wide or narrow range of activities recognized by and available to citizens under their existing system or multilayered systems of government. These constitute the official field of civic activities that each generation inherits and carries on from their forebears. Second, within these official fields there is a range of ways of 'acting otherwise' than the dominant norms of civic conduct without challenging the official rules governing citizen activity. This Spielraum of acting on the given possibilities in creative ways

⁵⁶ For feminist works on freedom in relationships to which I am particularly indebted see A. J. Norval, *Aversive Democracy: Inheritance and Originality in the Democratic Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007; L. Zerilli, *Feminism and the Abyss of Freedom*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2005; C. Heyes, *Line Drawings: Defining Women Through Feminist Practice*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000; P. Bowden, *Caring: Gender-Sensitive Ethics*, London: Routledge, 1997; K. Anderson, *A Recognition of Being: Reconstructing Native Womanhood*, Toronto: Sumach, 2000.

⁵⁷ For the disclosure of the field of civic activity from a civic rather than civil perspective, see N. Kompridis, *Critique and Disclosure: Critical Theory between Past and Future*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006.

and 'playing the civic game differently' within the official rules is, as we will see, a world of civic pluralism and cultural diversity unseen by approaches that presume rules determine rule-following.⁵⁸ The third and classic field comprises the activities by which citizens no longer act within the field of a governance relationship but turn and negotiate some aspect of that relationship. Finally, when citizen activities run against unjustifiable limits of the fields in which they act, act otherwise and negotiate, they turn to civic activities of directly confronting the limits. This range of activities from protests to revolutions comprises the field of civic confrontation strategies.⁵⁹ I discuss examples of these four types *en passant*, beginning with the third: negotiation.

One of the classic features that render an activity 'civic' is when the agents in a governance relationship not only negotiate how to act in accord with it but negotiate the relationship itself. This consists in (but is not restricted to) calling some aspect of the relationship into question and demanding that those who govern enter into negotiations, either within, over or without the acceptable procedures of negotiation (including litigation). This is a demand literally to *civicize* the relationship: to bring it under the shared negotiation and authority of the partners subject to it. If successful, the governance relationship is no longer imposed monologically over the governed who are constrained to negotiate their activities within its prescribed limits. It becomes a more cooperative, dialogical or citizen/governance relationship worked on by both partners through ongoing phases of 'negotiation' in the broad sense: contestation and critique, specific negotiations (arguing and bargaining), modification or transformation, implementation, review, renegotiation by future generations and so on, world without end. To civicize governance relationships is – *eo ipso* – to 'democratize' them, for one of the oldest and most ordinary meanings of 'democracy' is that the

⁵⁸ See Tully, *Public Philosophy* I and *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 8 for this type of civic activity. For an excellent introduction to the whole field, see A. Wiener, *The Invisible Constitution of Politics: Contested Norms of International Encounters*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. I discuss it further under the tenth aspect and in Subsection 6.

⁵⁹ These four types are distinctions within the field introduced under aspect five.

people have an effective and ongoing say in and over the relationships (rules) to which they are subject. The 'arts of citizenship' are precisely the democratic arts of critique, negotiation and transformation of the governance relationships we bear into citizen/governance relationships. This whole world of democratic negotiation in the broad sense is the classic world of *negotium* (civic action) as opposed to *otium* (the non-civic life of contemplation).⁶⁰

7. In contrast to the processes of *civilization* and *democratization* in the civil tradition, *civicization* and *democratization* are not identified with a set of Western institutions and processes of often coercive imposition over other practices, but with citizens non-violently negotiating and transforming the governance relationships in which they find themselves into citizen/governance relationships (or citizen relationships) from the ground up. This is the heart of civic citizenship. As we have just seen, this activity flows out of the proto-civic negotiated practices on the field of possibilities within the relationship. Both partners (governors and governed) enter into and subject themselves to the give and take of negotiation in and over the relationship they share. The governed *become* 'good citizens' only by exercising their civic freedom of entering into these kinds of negotiation in all their complex phases (above): of listening to the other sides and for silenced voices, of responding in turn, negotiating in good faith and being bound by the results, experimenting with the amended or transformed relationship and so on. Reciprocally, governors become good governors only by doing the same: listening to what the citizens have to say, responding and being held accountable by them. A citizen/governance relationship is an interdependent, interactive and open-ended partnership of mutual enabling, nurturing and reciprocal learning. The unpredictable evolution of the relationship and of the identities of the partners over time is what the civic tradition calls progress. If the governed fail to exercise their freedom of having a say in and over the governance relationships they bear and speak truthfully to power, they never become citizens. They remain unfree and

⁶⁰ Tully, *Public Philosophy I* is a series of surveys of this whole field.

servile ‘slaves’: that is, subjects of monological or ‘despotic’ relationships of command and obedience. It is like the life of ‘exile’, where one may have negative freedom but not civic freedom. Reciprocally, if the governors refuse to listen and enter into negotiations, and either silence citizens or treat their demands as free speech to which they have no obligation to respond, they never become good governors. They remain unaccountable ‘tyrants’, independent and subject only to their own arbitrary will and appetites. Neither becomes a mature human being.

A superb presentation of the civic relationship of reciprocal enlightenment between free governors and free citizens, where there is neither master nor slave but only free and frank speaking relationships (*parrhesiastic* dialogues) between partners, is the dialogue between Jocasta and Polyneices on the value of citizenship in Euripides’s *The Phoenician Women*. The two previous paragraphs are a gloss of this crystallization of civic freedom. Polyneices, who represents democracy, is returning from exile to free Thebes from his brother, Eteocles, who broke the pact to share rule on an annual basis and thus represents tyranny. He is speaking to his mother, Jocasta:⁶¹

JOCASTA: This above all I long to know: What is an exile’s life? Is it great misery?

POLYNEICES: The greatest; worse in reality than in report.

JOCASTA: Worse in what way? What chiefly galls an exile’s heart?

POLYNEICES: The worst is this: the right of speaking freely [*parrhesia*] does not exist.

JOCASTA: That’s a slave’s life – to be forbidden to speak one’s mind.

POLYNEICES: One has to endure the idiocy of those who rule.

JOCASTA: To join fools in their foolishness – that makes one sick.

POLYNEICES: One finds it pays to deny nature and be a slave.

⁶¹ Euripides, *The Phoenician Women*, New York: Penguin, 1983, lines 386–94. For the context of practices of free speaking in unequal relationships of governors and governed, see M. Foucault, *Fearless Speech*; J. Pearson, eds, Los Angeles: Semiotexte(e), 2001. For my interpretation and extension see J. Tully, ‘La liberté civique en contexte de globalisation’, *Les Cahiers du Juin* 27 1 (2): 1–10, 2003.

This account of interdependence and civic freedom in relationships also stands as a critique of the priority and adulation of independence and negative freedom in the civil tradition (as in tier-one civil rights). Agents who are independent and free of interdependent relationships, subject only to their own will, are on the road to becoming arbitrary tyrants, disposed to lording it over others and enslaved to their own whims and desires, as we have seen with the history of Western imperialism. It is only by being subject to democratic relationships with others and the practices of self-formation these require that those who govern can learn to discipline themselves and serve the civic good. Reciprocally, if citizenship is only a status, 'guaranteed' by institutions, then citizens tend to become either servile subordinates or arbitrary bosses in the vast sea of non-democratic, hierarchical relationships in which they find themselves for most of their lives. They tend to become unaccustomed, unable and too submissive to exercise their civic freedom in the official public sphere, let alone in the private sphere, and prone to submit uncritically to the socialization and media glorification of a life of negative freedom and private consumption that accompanies tier-one liberty and free trade.⁶² The powerful then dismantle the democratic rights that earlier generations of civic activists fought and died for.

As Jocasta and Polyneices agree, far from seeing dialogical relationships with governors and fellow citizens as interference with their negative freedom, they identify with these free-speaking relationships, as the enabling and nurturing conditions of their civic freedom and maturity. The crucial kind of freedom is thus neither the freedom from relationships of interdependency (negative freedom) nor the freedom of acting in conformity with allegedly ideal and universal legal relationships that 'we' impose on ourselves (positive freedom). It is the proto-civic and civic freedom of negotiating and democratizing

⁶² See B. Barber, *Consumed: How Markets Corrupt Children, Infantilize Adults, and Swallow Citizens Whole*, New York: Norton, 2007. For the pathological aspects of a relentless drive for negative freedom, see F. Bergmann, *On Being Free*, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1977.

in/over the always less-than-ideal relationships in which we live and breathe and become who we are. The only guarantee of freedom and democracy is, not surprisingly, the daily cooperative practices of democratic freedom in webs of relationships and on the fields of possibilities they disclose.⁶³

8. Civic activity is not restricted to the official, institutionalized civil public sphere of the modern nation state and the global civil sphere of cosmopolitan globalization. One does not have to be a civil citizen to engage in civic activity. Insofar as an individual or group is subject to the effects of a governance relationship, no matter how local or global, they have for that very reason a civic right to act civically in relation to it. A non-violent activity by the governed that brings the relationships they bear into the open space of questions and negotiations is an instance of the civic activity of citizens, no matter where it takes place, whether in the official public or private spheres. A civic public sphere, in contrast to the civil public sphere, comes into being whenever and wherever those who are subject to a closed governance relationship take it out of the darkness of the 'private sphere' of being unquestioned, either in the sense of being taken for granted and coordinating our interaction behind our backs or of being explicitly placed off limits. They do this by calling it into question (speaking truth to power), subjecting it to the light and enlightenment of public scrutiny, and opening it to negotiation with the powers-that-be. They become citizens, the space of negotiation becomes public and the relationship itself becomes civicized and democratized just insofar as the governors enter into, and are subject to, the ongoing negotiation of the relationship between them. Hence the popular slogan 'we are everywhere.'⁶⁴

⁶³ For a history of civic freedom in the narrow sense vis-à-vis the more familiar traditions of negative and positive freedom in the West see O. Patterson, *Freedom in the Making of Western Culture*, New York: Basic Books, 1991.

⁶⁴ As Nancy Fraser stresses, these unofficial public spheres are often more open and innovative than the elite-dominated official public sphere: N. Fraser, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy', in C. Calhoun, ed., *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992. For an introduction to this aspect of the field see R. Coles, *Beyond Gated Politics: Reflections for the Possibility of Democracy*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.

These civic and publicizing activities are not seen as acts of 'resistance' or 'rebellion', as they are seen from civil and governmental perspectives. It is rather the powers-that-be who refuse to enter into civic negotiations and be held accountable that engage in resistance and rebellion against civicization and democratization. They are also not seen as heroic acts of resistance by great leaders and writers overcoming the habituation, interpolation, conditioning or internalization that construct the very consciousness and body of the assimilated and colonized majority, as they are often portrayed in the critical tradition.⁶⁵ They are understood as the certainly courageous yet non-heroic extension of everyday practices of negotiation in which ordinary citizens are already engaged into the civic sphere. They consist in nothing more (or less) than disclosing the field of possibilities within the relationship from the standpoint of concerned citizens and acting on it.⁶⁶ Finally, they are not seen as the spontaneous irruption of unformed constituent power, for the civic powers are already exercised in, and extend out from, everyday practices and relationships of governance.⁶⁷

9. Why does the civic tradition construe cases of citizenship so broadly, as participation in activities of negotiating the arbitrary constraints of a field in governance or citizen/governance relationship at the most appropriate and effective sites by those affected? In contrast to the civil/cosmopolitan tradition this seems too unruly. Civil law circumscribes the exercise of democratic rights (tier two) to official citizens negotiating or litigating the law in the official institutions of civil/cosmopolitan society and in accord with their procedural rules, and, if necessary, their institutions of amendment of these rules. Members of the civic tradition agree that these are exceptionally important citizenship practices; noting as well that they have been fought for, institutionalized, extended and defended by civic citizens who did not initially have a right to them. But, they argue, to place these institutional limits on citizenship is to impose limits on democratic

⁶⁵ See note 54 for this view.

⁶⁶ Norval, *Aversive Democracy*, chapter 3.

⁶⁷ For these alternatives, see Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 7.

citizenship that are unsustainable in practice and unjustifiable in a free and democratic society. This follows from everything we have already said about the open-ended character of negotiated practices since the Introduction. However, it can be seen most clearly by comparing the civil and civic conceptions of law: the (civil) rule of law as an institution and the (civic) rule of law as a practice.

The civil tradition makes a fundamental distinction between the institutional rule of law and the citizen activities that take place within the boundaries of these institutional settings. The institutionalized rule of law exhibits a systemic or functional quality of formality and independence from the agents who are subject to it and act within its boundaries. This picture is encapsulated in the mantra, 'rule of law not of men.' The features of institutionalization and rationalization that establish the independence of the rule of law from the rule of men and women consist in the definite rules, procedures and training of the institutional offices, the hierarchical, command-obedience relationships among the members, the specialized division of labour, the separation of knowledge from use, reflexive monitoring and the systematic application of coercion to align behaviour with rules. That is, it is the non-democratic and procedural character of the relationships within an institution that give it its formality and independence from the informal rule of men. The language of governance is replaced by that of administration, management, control, discipline, procedure, direction and monitoring. As a consequence, the rules and procedures of an institution are conceptualized as 'rails' that the officeholders follow, like the operation of an adamantine calculus according to definite rules. The roles of humans seem to disappear.⁶⁸ While there may be some room for manoeuvre in individual cases of decision making by an errant officeholder, this foreground indeterminacy is absorbed by the systemic operation of the vast background rules, procedures

⁶⁸ For the misrepresenting role of the metaphor of the 'rule of law not of men' and the calculus conception of rule following, see G. P. Baker, 'Following Wittgenstein: Some Signposts for Philosophical Investigations 143-242', in S. Holtzman and C. Leich, eds, *Wittgenstein: To Follow a Rule*, London: Routledge, 1981, pp. 48-58.

and hierarchical relationships of the institutions as a whole that are untouched. If a background rule is challenged and negotiated, then this proceeds as well within institutionalized rules and procedures. Democratic rights (tier two) have their foundation in the institutional rule of law, are protected by it and exercised within its boundaries. This is the separation or disembedded thesis of the civil institutionalized rule of law.

In contrast, the civic understanding of the rule of law is of a network of relationships of negotiated practices. Law is a craft or practical art rather than a science. For example, men and women in ministries draft rules to govern the relationships of their political association as Bills; legislators debate, negotiate and vote on enacting them as laws; lobbyists lobby; administrators struggle to translate them into executable legislation and rules for application; civil servants apply them and officers enforce them, subjects try to figure out how to obey them in individual cases; experts advise them; ordinary citizens, corporate citizens, civil society organizations and media discuss and challenge them and take them back to their representatives or to the courts; lawyers argue pro and contra; judges discuss, interpret, judge, write majority and minority decisions; the legislatures respond and so on. At each of these site-specific practices men and women not only negotiate the particular law in question (which is just another rule) but they do so by acting in accord with the rules and procedures that govern the relationships of their office. As we have seen, the differentially situated players negotiate the Spielraum that the rules and procedures disclose to them, no matter how explicit the rules are and how many recursive sets of rules exist for the application of the rules.⁶⁹

This is not to deny the importance of institutionalized procedures. It is rather to observe that the way a person 'grasps' a procedural rule is not itself a procedure but a negotiated practice. The practical, know-how attitude underlies the institutional know-that orientation and is

⁶⁹ See Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, §§82–7, 198–201; and Tully, *Public Philosophy* I, chapter 2.

ineliminable. From this rule-maker, rule-enforcer, rule-follower, rule-challenger and rule-interpreter perspective, an institutionalized rule is neither a rail nor a calculus. It is more like a signpost. It points us to the complex network of negotiation practices going on under its sign. Both our understanding of the rule and the actual rule itself are immanent in the negotiated practices that cannot be circumscribed. The living rule of law is the pattern of interplay and interaction of the negotiated practices. This is the immanent or manifestation thesis of the civic rule of law. The unfolding of the rule of law, no matter how institutionalized and rationalized, is internally related to the indeterminate negotiated practices of the law.⁷⁰ In a word, civic citizens are 'constructivists'.⁷¹

If the civic thesis is plausible, there should not only be proto-civic negotiation practices within the institutions of the rule of law but these practices should extend in the course of things into demands for onsite civic negotiations, just as we have seen in the similarly institutionalized corporations of the official private sector. Historically, union movements and collective bargaining associations have been the agents of such sporadic civicization of institutions. Over the last 30 years there has been an explosion of new demands for ad hoc practical negotiations of the rules and procedures within the legal and political and administrative institutions of contemporary societies. Public and private sector employees demand a direct and effective say over the rules and covert conventions of the relationships they bear: hiring procedures, discriminatory practices, equity the organization of work and time-off, environmental practices, the right to disclose and make public information and bad practices, whistle blow and so on. These activities dissolve the distinction between the civil institutions

⁷⁰ See Medina, *The Unity of Wittgenstein's Philosophy*, p. 179. For a detailed presentation of this pragmatic view of normativity, see R. B. Brandom, *Making it Explicit: Reasoning, Representing, and Discursive Commitment*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998, pp. 3–66.

⁷¹ See A. Wiener, 'Constructivist Approaches in International Relations Theory: Puzzles and Promises', *Con.WEB* 5, 2006. Available at: www.qub.ac.uk/schools/SchoolofPoliticsInternationalStudiesandPhilosophy/FileStore/ConWEBFiles/Filetoupload,52215,en.pdf (Accessed 30 August 2007); and Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 5.

inhabited by civil servants and the exercise of democratic rights in civil society by civil citizens. Civil servants demand to be civic citizens within and over civil institutions, civicizing their governance relationships at work into citizen/governance relationships through the creation of tailor-made alternative dispute resolution practices. New departments, disciplines and epistemic communities of dispute resolution have sprung up in universities and policy communities throughout the world and the courts have supported this revolution on the grounds that its curtailment is unjustifiable and unsustainable in a free and democratic society.⁷²

10. We can now place the separation thesis of civil institutionalization in the broader canvas of Section One and see the two major roles it has played. In the early modern period the civil theorists argued that the existing practices of governance and citizenship constituted an informal, haphazard, conflict-ridden, uncertain and insecure crazy quilt of overlapping jurisdictions that gave rise to the Thirty Years War. Civil philosophers, lawyers and administrators explained that only centralization and institutionalization would resolve these problems of informal (underinstitutionalized and underrationalized) practices of law, governance and citizenship.⁷³ The modern contract tradition of political and legal theory rose to prominence by portraying this dispossession of local 'uncertain' practices of self-government in terms of a hypothetical contract or agreement. Despite the empirical evidence to the contrary, the recalcitrant local peoples could nevertheless be seen to be individuals (or a collective people) who would consent to delegate or alienate their powers and rights of local self-government to their new centralized and incorporated governors, if they only knew their best interests, in much the same way as they were contractually alienating their labour powers (formerly exercised in the local governance relationships of guilds, crafts, commons and so on) to the new

⁷² See Tully, *Public Philosophy* I, chapter 6.

⁷³ See I. Hunter, *Rival Enlightenments: Civil and Metaphysical Philosophy in Early Modern Germany*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001; and J. Tully, 'Diverse Enlightenments', *Economy and Society* 32 (3): 485–505, 2003.

institutions of private corporations. In exchange, they received from the institutions of government the security, certainty and enforceability of modern civil liberties and democratic rights at the national level. Their erstwhile local practices were portrayed in theory as a pre-political state of nature or war and their new institutions as the embodiment of the rule of law, not of men.

The idea that governors and citizens should exist in relationships of mutual subjection was not abandoned but applied exclusively to political relationships of representative government, where the elected government governed the population and the opposition party governed the government in a system of competing parties (organized internally along institutional lines). Citizens could play a role in this by exercising their democratic rights, but only in institutional elections and the civil sphere. This sphere of representative government was surrounded by and anchored in the new, administrative institutions of rule of law that provided the non-democratic basis of representative democracy. The prestige of the institutional mode of organization increased as more and more activities were organized accordingly: new model armies and navies, workhouses, public schools, factories, prisons, colonial plantations, labour discipline and the bureaucracies of the modern national and imperial states. In short, it became the favoured organizational form of the modern mode of citizenship and its constitutive institutions.⁷⁴

This transition to the modern institutional orientation undermined and reversed the old civic law convention that authoritative rights and government derive from long use and practice. Political authority was defined as an authority that was independent of relationships of interdependency and called 'sovereignty'. Sovereignty and right were now said to be above and behind 'government'; located in the central institutions of the modern state and placed there by the agreement of the people themselves precisely because it constituted

⁷⁴ J. Tully, *An Approach to Political Philosophy: Locke in Contexts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, pp. 9–70, 179–261.

a superior and uniquely modern form of rule, combining a sea of institutionalization with an island of representative governance.⁷⁵ The civil thesis of the superiority of institutional rule was the hinge of the whole transition.

The second role of the civil institutionalization thesis was to justify the dispossession of the non-European world of their local forms of government and citizenship. Under the civic convention that authority and right derive in endless forms from long use and negotiated practices the world was already full of authoritative governments and citizenship practices and thus there was no legal justification for Western imperialism. The way around this 'obstacle to progress' was to discredit it in the same manner as local governments were discounted within Europe, as not sufficiently institutionalized and independent of practice to be the bearers of formal law and sovereignty. Their laws were classified as informal and customary, still internally related to the vagaries of everyday practice, and the authority of their governors, if they were seen to exist at all, was non-sovereign or, at best, quasi-sovereign, still directly dependent on ongoing agreement of the governed who could dissolve authority by walking away from it. There was either no coercive mechanism in 'primitive societies' or the arbitrary exercise of coercion by men in the more advanced stages, but not the systematic application of coercion through the law characteristic of the West. The more sophisticated theorists allowed for lesser degrees of law and sovereignty, but mostly for the purpose of entering into treaties that extinguished or subordinated that sovereignty, and for a degree of continuity of indigenous self-government after conquest, yet under the sovereignty of European states. Non-Europeans thus were preemptively misrepresented as lacking precisely what Europe claimed to have in virtue of its recent institutionalization: the integration of

⁷⁵ J. Tully, *On the Duty of Man and Citizen According to Natural Law*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, introduction; Q. Skinner, *Visions of Politics, Volume II: Renaissance Virtues*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, chapter 14; Q. Skinner, *Visions of Politics Volume III: Hobbes and Civil Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, chapter 6.

law and coercion separate from the ruled. Once the civic thesis was relegated to the pre-modern and non-European by this sleight-of-hand, the imperialism of modern, institutionally sovereign states could be justified by the Trojan horse that claims to bring the institutional preconditions of modern law, government and citizenship to a world devoid of them.⁷⁶

Given the pivotal justificatory role of the civil/institutional conception of the rule of law in the global spread of the institutional form of organization it is scarcely surprising that it is difficult to dislodge it even after it has been shown to be untenable in theory. Although it has been shown that no system of rules could possibly be as autonomous as the civil thesis requires, that there are differences of degree but not of the formal/informal kind among Western and non-Western legal and political orders, that negotiated practical know-how grounds procedural competence and that normativity remains related to use and negotiated practice in complicated ways, nevertheless, the background picture continues to prevail. But, as always, the most effective disprove is the pragmatic one. It includes the examples of the civicization and democratization of civil institutions by their own members that are so prominent today (above) and the obvious ability of non-Western peoples to govern themselves by their own distinctive laws and ways.⁷⁷

11. I want to turn to the other general type of civic relationship that I set aside above: the citizen relationship. These are relationships among fellow citizens as equals in which there is no citizen/governor distinction. For the civic tradition this is the more important type of civic relationship. These are the relationships citizens form whenever and wherever they 'act together' as citizens in various activities. The relationships are civic and democratic partnerships among equals negotiating and acting together. These are relationships of trust, conviviality or solidarity and civic friendship across identity-related

⁷⁶ Tully, *Strange Multiplicity*, pp. 58–98, and *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 7.

⁷⁷ See Subsection 6.

differences and disagreements of various kinds. This is the realm of civic freedom as *isegoria*, citizens speaking to each other in equal relationships about their common concerns, rather than *parrhesia*, speaking to their governors in unequal relationships. On occasion one partner may take the lead and the others follow, especially when the task at hand requires specialized skills, but it does not become a citizen/governance relationship, let alone a governance relationship, because the leader ceases to be a leader whenever the followers cease to follow. It then automatically becomes a relationship of equals acting together again and they co-organize or 'coordinate' their interaction co-equally. It is tempting to say that they 'govern together' or are 'self-governing', but they are not 'governing' insofar as this term entails the correlate of the 'governed'. They are neither governing and being governed in turn nor simultaneously governing others and being governed by them. They are exercising power *together as* citizens all the way down. The citizenry cooperatively 'citizenize' rather than 'govern' the association composed of their citizen partnerships. They are literally 'doing democracy'. This is a distinct mode of exercising power different from governance and institutionalization.⁷⁸

There are two main families of citizen partnerships. One is when citizens organize themselves in order to negotiate in or over a citizen/governance relationship, as in deliberative fora, collective bargaining, negotiating NGOs, social movements and non-violent revolutionary movements insofar as their internal relationships are citizen partnerships. The other is when citizens organize and run an entire activity on the basis of citizen partnership, not in relation to a government, but to citizenize the activity for its own sake (rather than submit to institutionalization or governance). The classic examples of citizen partnerships are the celebrated practices of direct democracy, village commons and urban communes throughout history and today, such as *Porte Allegro*, autonomous communities in the North and

⁷⁸ The verb 'citizenize' first appeared in 1593.

South and the Zapatista. However, the most ubiquitous and familiar example is the vast array of civic 'cooperatives' in the broad sense of civic organizations comprised of citizen relationships.

If the private corporation is both the basis and flagship of modern citizenship – the institution in which moderns exercise their civil liberties in competing, working, shopping and consuming – then the commonplace cooperative is the comparative organization of the civic tradition. Here citizens ignore the civil division between (non-democratic) private and (representative) public spheres, between civil liberties and democratic rights. They participate as democratic citizens governing themselves directly in the economic sphere (and other spheres), citizenizing the same kinds of activity that corporations privatize. In contrast to individual and corporate competition in market relations, cooperatives are founded on the ethics of cooperation. In the place of competitive free trade, they practice fair trade: trade relationships based on non-violent democratic negotiations among all citizens affected. In contrast to the goal of profit, many coops are not for profit but for living democracy and mutual aid. Instead of globalizing from above, they are grounded in the local first and foremost. All the human creativity that is channelled into the world of commerce and private profit by corporations is poured into experimentation with forms of democratic cooperation by the cooperative movements.⁷⁹ The most astonishing feature of the countless cooperatives on the planet is that they manifest, in concrete and practical forms, actual alternative worlds of democratic citizen partnerships *within* the interstices of the globally dominant political, legal and economic institutions of modern citizenship. They do not organize to overthrow the state or the capitalist mode of production, or to confront and negotiate with governors to change this or that regulation. They simply *enact* alternative worlds

⁷⁹ For the contrastive dimensions of the private corporation listed in this paragraph, see J. Bakan, *The Corporation: The Pathological Pursuit of Profit and Power*, London: Penguin, 2004.

of citizen relationships around various activities, refusing to abjure their civicism to privatization or governmentalization. Cooperatives are thus classic examples of ‘acting otherwise’.⁸⁰

12. A civic activity also has another important aspect, the telos or good towards which the activity is oriented and which the activity upholds and manifests. It gives the activity its civic character or ethos. A civic telos is thus a ‘civic good’. Modern citizenship is ‘egocentric’, oriented towards the protection of the liberty of individuals to be free from interference and to be free to exercise their autonomy in the private sphere (tier-one rights) or in the official public sphere (tier-two rights). In contrast, diverse citizenship in both citizen and governance/citizen relationships is ecocentric and human-centric (or relationship-centric in both cases). Civic activities are oriented towards *caring for* the public or ‘civic goods’ of the correlative ‘city’: namely, the community and its members bound together by citizen/governance and citizen relationships in interdependency relationships with non-human animals and the environment they bear as inhabitants of the natural habitat.⁸¹ Civic goods are multiplex and they too are subject to ongoing democratic negotiation. They include such democratic goods as civicizing relationships in many spheres and the character development and conviviality that come from participation; and such substantive goods as caring for the environment, economic self-reliance, mutual aid, fair trade, equality among citizens and so on. When civic citizens call a particular governance relationship into question they do so under the general critical ideal that it fails to realize civic goods in

⁸⁰ For an introduction to cooperatives and cooperative democracy in this broad sense, see the global survey www.WiserEarth.org under *Civil Society Organizations*. For the history of consumer and producer cooperatives respectively, see E. Furlough and C. Strikwerda, eds, *Consumers against Capitalism? Consumer Cooperation in Europe, North America, and Japan 1840–1990*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999 and K. M. Grimes and L. Milgram, eds, *Artisans and Cooperatives: Developing Alternative Trade for the Global Economy*, Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2000. For autonomous movements in Europe, see G. Katsiaficas, *The Subversion of Politics: European Autonomous Movements and the Decolonization of Everyday Life*, New York: Humanities, 2007.

⁸¹ See Bowden, *Caring*, pp. 141–82; Anderson, *Recognition of Being*, pp. 194–229.

some specific way or another. These are goods that make possible and enhance civic forms of life.⁸²

13. Civic citizens are thus 'care takers' of the goods of the dwelling places in which they live in this broad sense that dissolves the modern distinction between culture and nature. Every locale and network of locales of civic activity is not only culturally diverse but also a place in the natural world with its web of relationships of biological and ecological diversity. They see the interactive and interdependent relationships between humans and nature as similar in kind to human relationships and they attend to and care for them in similar ways. They listen and respond carefully to nature as a living being (Gaia) in their ecological sciences and daily practices of treading lightly. Civic citizens realize that this non-metaphorical field of possibilities in human/natural relationships and its limited Spielraum is the ground of all others. They are Gaia citizens.⁸³

They also take their civic responsibility of caring for the good of communities and members *in* dwelling places and placeways to be prior to protecting the liberty rights of abstract individuals. They translate the latter back into one important civic good (negative freedom), detach it from free trade and place it among other goods that vie for attention in civic deliberative practices. They also reply that, in many cases, what oppressed individuals and minorities say they want is not protection from their own communities by a tier-one right enforced by a distant national or international court, but democratic empowerment in their local communities (civic freedom). In theories of modernity, this grounded civic ethic is discredited by redescribing it as a pre-modern

⁸² In his global survey of civic organizations, Paul Hawken classifies these goods into two main categories, social justice and the environment: P. Hawken, *Blessed Unrest: How the Largest Movement in the World Came into Being and Why No One Saw it Coming*, New York: Viking, 2007. For the contrast between ego-centric and eco-centric ethics, see Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 3.

⁸³ For a historical and interdisciplinary introduction to this ecological dimension of citizenship, see E. F. Moran, *People and Nature: An Introduction to Human Ecological Relations*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. See also J. Borrows, *Recovering Canada: The Resurgence of Indigenous Law*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002; F. Capra, *The Web of Life: A New Synthesis of Mind and Matter*, New York: Anchor Books, 1996; J. Lovelock, *The Revenge of Gaia: Why the Earth Is Fighting Back – and How We Can Still Save Humanity*, London: Penguin, 2007, chapter 6; Hawken, *Blessed Unrest*.

stage of historical and moral development and as a particular ethics of care in contrast to the allegedly higher and universal theory of morality and justice for the abstracted and independent individuals of modern citizenship. And the public good is redescribed as the spread of modern liberties and their underlying institutions of economic growth.⁸⁴ Notwithstanding the hegemony of this egocentric worldview with the rise of Western imperialism, multilayered ethics of civic freedom and care in human and natural relationships have been and continue to be the more basic and widely endorsed orientation of the world's peoples in their diverse cultures and traditions for millennia.⁸⁵ Moreover, the dawning awareness of the destruction of local communities, environmental devastation, global warming and climate change brought about by four centuries of expansion and exploitation under the sway of this modernizing orientation, in which these public bads are concealed as 'externalities', is gradually undermining its credibility and paramourcy. Not only environmental and climate scientists of the world community and millions of citizens but even former modernizers and globalizers are quietly walking away from it and coming around to see the good of this alternative way of being a citizen *in* the world.⁸⁶

14. Civic citizens are learning to be non-violent game players and one of their most important civic activities today is the teaching and practice of non-violent dispute resolution and disarmament. As we have seen, the institutions of civil citizenship are spread and enforced by coercion. The justification for this is that people without the canonical civil institutions are not civilized and thus are not trustworthy. It is rational to distrust and fear them in their state of lawlessness and insecurity.

⁸⁴ As we have seen in Subsection 4 and Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapters 1, 4, 5 and 7.

⁸⁵ For the anthropological and interdisciplinary literature on this claim see Moran, *People and Nature*.

⁸⁶ For examples of this turn in the World Bank, see H. Daly and J. Cobb, *For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy Community, the Environment, and a Sustainable Future*, Boston: Beacon, 1994 and J. Stiglitz, *Globalization and its Discontents*, London: Allen Lane, 2002. Hawken, *Blessed Unrest*, dates the transitions to an ecological orientation among civic activists in non-indigenous North America to the influence of Thoreau and Emerson in the mid-nineteenth century, Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* in the 1960s, the environmental and social justice movements and climate change and global warming. In Canada one would add the name of David Suzuki.

Only the civilizing force of institutionalized modern law and capitalism can render them civilized, predictable and trustworthy. If they do not submit or remove themselves, coercion can and should be used. Not surprisingly, the peoples in their own civilizational relationships who are approached, occupied and continuously patrolled by armed foreigners with this aggressive superior/inferior attitude and conduct respond by fearing and distrusting *them*, and trying to protect themselves and expel the uninvited and uncivilized guests. The dynamics of fear and hatred and war preparation and war ensue.⁸⁷

Democratic citizens have learned from this depressing history that distrust and violence beget distrust and violence and from the history of non-violence that there is another more powerful way that leads to peace. They start from the simple premise that humans in all civilizations are already familiar with proto-civic and civicizing relationships, even imperialistic Westerners, and thus already able to recognize and enter into others. Accordingly, they approach others unarmed and with the embodied attitude and comportment of openness and trustworthiness. This takes the phenomenological form of the extended open hand, which says 'I trust you and come in peace, please reciprocate' in almost all cultures, in opposition to the closed fist. Only this vulnerable yet courageous and disarming comportment of groundless trust can initiate the reciprocal, pre-linguistic response and begin to weave a negotiated relationship of grounded mutual trust one strand at a time, civicizing the partners as they interact, just as one does across differences in one's own neighbourhood. Democratization cannot be spread by imposing institutional preconditions because non-violent grass roots democratic relationships are the preconditions of democratization. Consequently, peace cannot be the end of a long historical process of war and the spread of Western institutions. Peace is the *way*.⁸⁸ This commitment

⁸⁷ As we saw in Subsection 4.

⁸⁸ This view, which is antithetical to modern imperial citizenship, is widely recognized in different ethical and spiritual traditions. For example, M. K. Gandhi, *All Men are Brothers: Autobiographical Reflections*, New York: Continuum, 2005; J. Vanier, *Finding Peace*, Toronto: Anansi, 2003; T. Hanh, *Keeping the Peace*, Berkeley: Parallax, 2005; D. Chopra, *Peace Is the Way: Bringing War and Violence to an End*, New York: Three Rivers, 2005.

to non-violent democratic foreign policy is simply the extension of the non-coerced first step into civic citizenship (under aspect three).⁸⁹

15. The final aspect of civic citizenship arises when citizens run up against unjustifiable limits to the civic activities in citizen/governance and citizen relationships that we have been discussing. In any of these activities there is always a vast ensemble of relationships that are not open to negotiation in the course of the activities. These background non-negotiable relationships 'structure' and limit the foreground field of possible actions in citizen/governance and citizen relationships. I will call these discursive and non-discursive relationships 'structural' relationships. If citizens try to bring these into the space of negotiation they are met with refusal, often because the structural relationships are the very basis of the unequal power and universal claim to authority of the hegemonic partners with whom they are negotiating. When, for example, a network of citizens negotiates with a multinational corporation over the sweatshop conditions under which their products are made, the multinational corporation and the global legal, economic and military relationships that support it remain immovably in the background, structuring the limited and unequal field of negotiable relationships. If citizens attempt to 'overcome' these background structural relationships, either by bringing them into the field of foreground negotiations (thereby transforming them into governance and citizen/governance relationships) or by overthrowing them entirely, as in a revolution, they move beyond negotiation to 'strategies of confrontation.' Confrontation strategies comprise the fourth type of civic activities.⁹⁰

The problem (from a civic standpoint) is not only that there are such background structural relationships to any local negotiation, but that, as we saw in Section One, local structures are embedded in complex layers of

⁸⁹ For the civic tradition of non-violence, see P. Ackerman and J. Duvall, *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Non-Violent Conflict*, New York: St Martin's, 2000; M. Kurlansky, *Nonviolence: Twenty-Five Lessons from the History of a Dangerous Idea*, New York: Modern Library, 2006 and Transcend International, *Transcend: A Peace and Development Network for Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means*, www.transcend.org.

⁹⁰ See under aspect six.

national and imperial structural relationships of inequality, dependency and exploitation that have been built up over half a millennium. This vast network of multilayered structuration appears to be a 'world system' capable of *integrating* the foreground play of specific civic negotiations into its daily reproduction and expansion.⁹¹ In many theories this is precisely what is meant by 'globalization'. No responsible account of civic citizenship can avoid the question of how citizens can confront, de-imperialize and civicize this imperial leviathan, which seems able to make playthings out of the other three types of civic activity. All of Subsection 6 addresses this question. However, to make the transition I want to clarify the terms of structure (structural relationships) and agency (confrontation strategies) that disclose the field.

It is important to note first that all forms of civic activity take place within background structural relationships that are not open to negotiation *in the course of* the foreground negotiations. They are background enabling conditions that facilitate negotiations while foreclosing infinite regress. In the sweatshop example, the citizens appeal to sections of the background transnational trade law and international law to bring the multinational to the table. Civil citizens interpret them as the very 'conditions of possibility' of civic engagement and the grounds of universalizable citizenship, whereas civic citizens interpret them as singular and contingent enabling conditions of a particular form of civic engagement with a history of struggles behind them, but they both agree on their role in civic activities. They have to be held firm for the negotiations to take place, or, from the civic orientation, the activity of negotiating holds them in place. Thus, it is not the structural role of such relationships that makes them objectionable, as long as they are open to civic questioning and negotiations under other circumstances.⁹²

Rather, what makes structural relationships objectionable from the civic perspective is when they do not enable civic citizens to care for

⁹¹ The classic presentation of this is Immanuel Wallerstein's world systems theory. See the *Journal of World Systems Research* for this approach.

⁹² As we saw in aspect nine.

civic goods but disable them in some way. They suppress, disallow, block, arbitrarily constrain, misrecognize, render negotiators unequal, include and assimilate, co-opt and enable the powerful to bypass the democratizing negotiations of citizens. Structural relationships that play these anti-democratic roles are structural relationships of 'domination'. They are the target of confrontation strategies.

If we focus on the classic modern revolutions against a state system of domination as the abstract paradigm of confrontation then there appears to be a sharp binary distinction between negotiation and confrontation. In confrontations 'revolutionary' citizens 'liberate' themselves from a structure of domination, whereas in negotiations 'reforming' citizens exercise their limited civic freedom within it. But this unsituated picture obscures the complexity of real-world civic struggles in locales. From the situated perspective of civic citizens engaged in concrete civic activities, confrontation strategies form a continuum from refusing to negotiate in accordance with the rules to revolution. It is difficult to draw a sharp distinction between negotiation and confrontation. When does a negotiating tactic become an act of confrontation: refusal to follow an order, speaking truth to power, walk out, witnessing, sit in, protest, strike, general strike, picket line, road block, local or global boycott, coordinated uprising, rebellion or revolution? In each case, the citizens are refusing to negotiate and confronting what is, from their local perspective, a structural relationship of domination. On what grounds, other than the binary paradigm, could one say that a reforming negotiator who takes this courageous step within the negotiations is necessarily co-opted and ineffective, whereas the citizens who refuse to enter into negotiations and organize for the revolution from the outside are necessarily confrontational and effective? Even retrospectively it is difficult to say which confrontation activities precipitated an overall change or transformation.

Confrontational strategies are multiplex not only in their tactics but also in the civic activities they initiate. Think of these examples. Citizens who have no civil right to protest or demonstrate against harms to civil goods do so anyway, not simply to protest monologically, but to force

the powers-that-be to enter into negotiations, and they see this as a success only if mutually binding negotiations transpire. In other cases, citizens bypass protests and simply engage in a form of civic activity even though they do not have the civil right to do so and on the ground that it needs to be done. *Médecins sans Frontières* (Doctors without Borders) is a global example of this phenomenon of ‘acting otherwise’ without a civil right but not without civic right.⁹³ If these sorts of confrontation turn out to be successful, the initiatory precedents often harden into a customary or institutionalized civil right to continue to engage in them (as in aspect 3, pp. 37–41). They are exemplars of extending the use of ‘citizenship’ by enacting it that we discussed in the Introduction. Neither case fits the revolutionary model yet each may well be revolutionary in its consequences. Conversely, neither is a case of lawlessness or ‘anything goes’ for both are undertaken for the sake of civic good and to bring the activity under civicizing relationships. As we saw in Subsection 3, such confrontational precedents are often absorbed into the civil institutions and their civic history forgotten.

Correlative with the tendency to construe confrontation in terms of revolution is the tendency to view structural relationships of domination through the paradigm of a bounded system like a state or a system of states (as is presupposed in the use of ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ above). Yet, from the civic standpoint, structural relationships of domination are neither bounded nor systemic. The common experience of confrontations suggests otherwise. When citizens overthrow a local structural relationship or convert it into a citizen/governance relationship (or a citizen relationship in cases of cooperatizing private corporations), they find a further layer of dominating structural relationships behind it, and so always have to begin again the next morning.⁹⁴ The decisive example is the decolonization revolutions of the mid-twentieth century and the de-imperialization revolutions in the

⁹³ *Médecins sans Frontières*, www.msf.org. For an analysis of this example from a civic perspective see M. Foucault, ‘Confronting Governments: Human Rights’, in J. B. Faubion, ed., *The Essential Works*, Volume III, New York: New Press, 2000.

⁹⁴ See Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 4.

new world order today. As we saw in Subsection 4, citizens of the colonies were able to overthrow structural relationships of *political* domination (colonialism), by a complex repertoire of confrontation strategies, but they found the political powers they (or their elites) acquired deeply embedded in further layers of background imperial structural relationships of domination. The revolutionary anti-imperial struggles since the end of decolonization have confirmed this complex situation. A successful revolution against the local dependent elite is followed by financial boycotts, economic pressure, tactics of destabilization, covert and proxy military operations and, if necessary, the overt fist of US military intervention in order to 'overthrow' the popular government.⁹⁵ The classic picture of a bounded people overthrowing their unjust regime and setting up a new government as they see fit within bounded states has quite limited application, yet it continues to prevail, perhaps because it hides the unjust reality.

These examples, and others to follow, also illustrate what we saw in Subsection 4. The structural relationships of domination are not only layered rather than bounded but also networked rather than systemic. What holds structural relationships of domination in place and integrates both civic negotiations *and* confrontations into an ongoing global organization is neither a functional property of a world system nor a hidden hand, as it appears from the theoretical gaze. Rather, it is the actual contingent exercise by humans of all the considerable means available to the hegemonic partners in the layers of informal imperial networks that encircle the globe. The networkization of informal imperialism beginning in the 1970s consists in linking together the various unequal nodes (communicative, economic, financial, military,

⁹⁵ In addition to the literature referred to in *Volume II*, in chapters 5 and 7, see S. Kinzer, *Overthrow: America's Century of Regime Change from Hawaii to Iraq*, New York: Holt, H, 2006; J. Carroll, *House of War: The Pentagon and the Disastrous Rise of American Power*, New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2006; C. Johnson, *Nemesis: The Last Days of the American Republic*, New York: Metropolitan, 2006; for the early history of intervention, see R. Kagan, *Dangerous Nation: America's Foreign Policy from its Earliest Days to the Dawn of the Twentieth Century*, New York: Vintage, 2007. The imperialists celebrate these overthrows. See, for example, R. D. Kaplan, *Imperial Grunts: The American Military on the Ground*, New York: Random House, 2002.

legal, educational and so on) in structural and governance relationships that make up the network. For our purposes, the crucial feature of this non-systemic form of organization is that the nodes are composed of humans networking in a variety of different forms of association, yet all of which rest ultimately on the negotiated practices of the participants in their relationships with each other.⁹⁶ At the end of the day, therefore, what keeps the imperial network going and the structural relationships of domination in their background place, is nothing more (or less) than the activities of powerfully situated actors to resist, contain, roll-back and circumscribe the uncontainable democratizing negotiations and confrontations of civic citizens in a multiplicity of local nodes. These sites of civic activity are the Achilles Heel of informal imperialism. To see them as a systemic structure and to organize confrontation accordingly is to misrepresent the field of local and global citizenship and to overlook the concrete possibilities available on it for creative and effective negotiations and confrontations of civicization and de-imperialization.

With this more accurate survey of the field in hand we are now in a position to turn to glocal citizenship practices.

6. The glocalization of civic and glocal citizenship

I want now to examine two main ways diverse citizenship spreads around the globe. The first is the persistence and recent renaissance of local forms of civic citizenship practices despite the globalization of modern citizenship. The second is by the global civic federation and networkization of local diverse citizenship practices. I call this global networking 'glocalization' and the networkers 'glocal citizens' because they are grounded in and hyperextend the civic features of local citizenship.⁹⁷

⁹⁶ For the networkization of informal imperial governance see Tully, *Public Philosophy II*, chapter 6. See also *Public Philosophy II*, chapter 3 for another argument for the non-systemic character of large historical concatenations of practices.

⁹⁷ Subsection 6 draws on the chapters and literature referred to in Tully, *Public Philosophy II*.

I will also discuss these two ways of glocalizing civic citizenship in relation to the global crisis of citizenship we examined in Subsection 4. To recollect, the formal and then informal imperial spread of modern citizenship and the underlying institutions it sends on ahead to lay the foundations of civilization has led in many cases, at best, to a form of global cosmopolitan citizenship for official NGOs and multinational corporations, low-intensity citizenship for dependent elites of the former colonies, the dispossession or marginalization of local citizenship and governance, the subordination of local economies and polities to global corporations and trade regimes, enormous inequalities, violent cycles of repression and resistance and increasing environmental destruction. This crisis of modernity/coloniality has coincided with a crisis of democratic deficits in the representative democracies of the hegemonic states. The informal imperial networks of economic, legal, cultural, media, security and military relationships not only bypass and undercut the diverse citizenship of billions of people who are governed by them, they also manipulate, downsize and disregard the representative and legal institutions of modern citizenship that are supposed to bring them under representative authority. These trends of globalization constitute a crisis of global citizenship that, viewed in isolation, fosters a pervasive sense of disempowerment and disenchantment. I want now to move around and re-interpret them from the standpoint of glocal citizenship.

First, despite these devastating trends, another world of legal, political, ecological and even economic diversity has survived and continues to be the *loci* of civic activities for millions of people. The reason for this remarkable survival and renaissance in the post-colonial world, unknown to the dominant debate over global citizenship, is that Western imperialism governs through indirect or informal means and thus depends on the active collaboration of imperialized peoples exercising constrained local self-government in their own cultural ways. Those who are not part of the Westernized elite have been able to keep their diverse practices and forms of life alive to some extent within the considerable Spielraum of informal dependency relationships. Another

world of pluralism exists in the interstices of globalization.⁹⁸ One of the most astonishing examples is the survival and resurgence of 300 million indigenous peoples with their traditions of governance and Gaia-based citizenship after 500 years of genocide, dispossession, marginalization and relentless assimilation.⁹⁹ The lived experience of citizenship in the present age is thus different from and more multiplex than it is portrayed through the sweeping generalizations of globalization theories of both defenders and critics.¹⁰⁰

Many existing diverse practices of governance have been corrupted into exploitative and despotic relationships by their dependency on indirect rule and others were non-civic from the get go.¹⁰¹ The point is neither to reject them simply because they are non-modern nor to uncritically accept them because they are different or traditional. It is rather to bring them into comparative and critical discussions with other forms of governance and citizenship and to explore ways citizens can civicize them by speaking and acting within them.¹⁰² In the modernized West a vast repertoire of local citizenship practices have also survived within the interstices of state-centric modern citizenship, such as traditional working-class organizations and new and creative forms of coops and networks linking rural and urban citizens in countless ways and around various civic goods (the environment, non-violent dispute

⁹⁸ See Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapters 5 and 7; for an introduction to this historical field, see L. Benton, *Law and Colonial Cultures: Legal Regimes in World History, 1400–1990*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

⁹⁹ J. Mander and V. Tauli-Corpuz, eds, *Paradigm Wars: Indigenous Peoples' Resistance to Economic Globalization*, San Francisco: International Forum on Globalization, 2005.

¹⁰⁰ V. Shiva, *Earth Democracy: Justice, Sustainability and Peace*, Cambridge: South End, 2005; D. McNally, *Another World is Possible: Globalization and Anti-Capitalism*, Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring, 2006.

¹⁰¹ As we have seen in Subsection 4, the role of the United States' military and multinational corporations in countries in Latin America and Saudi Arabia (and other petrotyrannies) are examples of how informal imperialism (by a low intensity civil democracy) corrupts local governments, props up the most repressive regimes and subverts grass roots democracy. For Latin America, see Grandin, *Empire's Workshop*. For Saudi Arabia, see R. Vitalis, *America's Kingdom: Mythmaking on the Saudi Oil Frontier*, San Francisco: Stanford University Press, 2007. For a general survey of the petrotyrannies under informal imperialism, see J. Bacher, *Petrotyranny*, Toronto: Dundurn, 2000.

¹⁰² M. Mamdani, 'Beyond Settler and Natives as Political Identities: Overcoming the Legacy of Colonialism', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 43 (4): 651–64, 2001.

resolution, low-cost housing, anti-racism, organic farming, place-based pedagogy, neighbourhood security and so on). These old and new citizenship practices and improvisations are multiplying rapidly today in the 'return to the local' of a new generation disenchanted with the elite manipulation of representative citizenship, the destruction of local communities by a half millennia of globalization from above, and moved by the ecological revolution of the last century.¹⁰³

The second example of glocalizing civic citizenship is the array of movements to 'democratize democracy' we touched on in Subsection 5. The aim of these movements is to democratize the legal, political and bureaucratic institutions of modern representative democracy so that the people who are subject to them are consulted and have an effective negotiated say within them *wherever* power is exercised non-democratically and unaccountably, in ad hoc confrontations of speaking out and 'going public' or in more formal modes of negotiation in which those who govern must listen and give an account. These are thus movements to 'civicize' the civil institutions of modern citizenship. Here civic citizens join hands with civil citizens engaged in the same projects from within – such as proportional representation, deliberative democracy, democratic constitutionalism, legal and political pluralism and civic *versus* civil security. Globally, they include the movements to democratize the institutions of global governance and to establish the UN as an effective democratic forum that represents the majority of the peoples of the world who are subject to the relationships of inequality, dependency and exploitation.¹⁰⁴

Third, since decolonization and the triumph of informal imperialism, millions of the world's poor have been forced to migrate from the

¹⁰³ C. Hines, *Localization: A Global Manifesto*, London: Earthscan, 2000.

¹⁰⁴ B. de Sousa Santos, eds, *Democratizing Democracy: Beyond the Liberal Democratic Canon*, London: Verso, 2005; I. Loader and N. Walker, *Civilizing Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007; D. Archibugi, D. Held and M. Köhler, eds, *Re-imagining Political Community: Studies in Contemporary Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity, 1998; and Volume II, chapters 2 and 4. Bronislaw Malinowski called for the democratization of the United Nations at its inception and predicted the imperial and violent consequences of the control of the great powers, in B. Malinowski, *Freedom and Civilization*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1944, pp. 1–16.

colonized world to the imperial countries to find work in a closely controlled global labour market.¹⁰⁵ Despite the hardships of poverty, slavery, exploitation, racism, xenophobia and second-class or non-citizenship, they refuse to be servile subjects. Instead, they exercise their civic citizenship in new and untoward ways, negotiating their diverse cultural ways into the public and private institutions of modern citizenship. This 'journey back' or 'boomerang effect' of formerly colonized peoples now civicizing the imperial countries challenges the dominant imperial, nationalist and racist cultures encoded in modern citizenship institutions and creates new forms of multiculturalism and multi-civilizationalism on the ground, both in the urban centres and the diasporic relationships (transnational civicscapes) they sustain with their former countries. These grass roots multicultural communities in 'mongrel cities' generate new kinds of citizen relationships of conviviality among their members and supportive local civic citizens groups which are often overlooked by, or poorly integrated into, the official policies of respect for diversity.¹⁰⁶

These three examples and many others similar to them are existing practices of local civic citizenship. These worldwide local sources and resources of civic citizenship are much stronger and resilient than we think. They are the bases of glocal citizenship. NGOs, social movements, networks, informal civic federations and similar creative improvizations are the means by which glocal citizens link together and so glocalize these local civic bases. These networks are civic and glocal just insofar as they (1) are grounded in and accountable to the local civic nodes, and (2) hyperextend civic relationships (citizen and citizen/governance) and other civic aspects in their own organization and their relationships with others. Of course not all networks are composed of citizen and citizen/governance partnerships. Many are institutional and governmental in form. They 'mobilize' rather than civicize. However, the network mode

¹⁰⁵ A. Richmond, *Global Apartheid: Refugees, Racism, and the New World Order*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

¹⁰⁶ L. Sandercock, *Cosmopolis II: Mongrel Cities in the Twenty-First Century*, London: Continuum, 2003; and Tully, *Public Philosophy II*, chapter 8.

of organization has the flexibility and potential to be organized civically and democratically all the way down. This mode of being-with is within its field of possibilities.¹⁰⁷ If, in contrast, networkers are organized institutionally and/or governmentally, and if they see themselves as the bearers of the gifts of civilization and modern citizenship to the less-developed, then they are modern (civil and cosmopolitan), imperial networks.¹⁰⁸ In addition to providing mutual learning and aid to their member civic nodes, glocal networks also crucially provide the civic means of democratizing the persisting global imperial relationships of inequality, exploitation and dependency that are the major causes of the crisis of global citizenship. Glocal networks do this counter-hegemonic work of de-imperializing the world in two main ways.

First, as we have seen in Subsection 4, the persisting economic, legal, political, debt, media, educational and military relationships of informal imperialism are so unequal that, although the elites within the former colonies are able to have a say and negotiate (in global governance institutions and elsewhere), they (the G120) are barely able to modify these governance relationships, let alone transform them into governance/citizen relationships, and they are in turn scarcely in civicized relationships with their own people (the majority of the world's population). Similarly, the hegemonic partners in the relationships – the great powers and their multinational corporations – are not held democratically accountable by their own citizens. Even where there are well-defined international laws and rights, the more powerful bypass or manipulate them to their advantage so they function as a legitimating façade rather than an effective guarantee.¹⁰⁹ As we have

¹⁰⁷ Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 6.

¹⁰⁸ A. Ayers, 'Demystifying Democratization: The Global Constitution of (Neo) Liberal Politics in Africa', *Third World Quarterly* 27 (2): 312–38, 2006; T. Evans and A. Ayers, 'In the Service of Power: The Global Political Economy of Citizenship and Human Rights', *Citizenship Studies* 10 (3): 289–308, 2006.

¹⁰⁹ See Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 4. This is also the conclusion of Ishay, *History of Human Rights*, and she recommends glocal citizenship networks as the most effective response (pp. 348–9). This is also the view of V. Shiva, 'The Greening of Global Reach', in S. Daly and P. Routledge, eds, *The Geopolitics Reader*, London: Routledge, 1998; and A. Dobson, 'States, Citizens and the Environment', in Skinner and Stråth, eds, *States and Citizens*.

seen in the domestic context, the only guarantee of democratic rights is the concrete exercise of civic freedom. Accordingly, the first role of a glocal network is to glocally link together enough local citizenship practices of those who are governed by any of these relationships to single it out and contest it: to call its existence and privacy into the space of public questioning and put enough soft power pressure on the responsible powers-that-be to bring them to negotiations in the most effective place or places. It is thus the glocalization of the whole practice of civic negotiation and confrontation vis-à-vis unequal global governance relationships outlined in Subsection 5.

Networked contestation, negotiation and confrontation can take place anywhere and by anybody in the relationships (e.g. in sweat shops and/or consumer boycott of sweatshop products, in the WTO or in protest against the WTO). It should not be the burden of the wretched of the earth to refuse to submit and act otherwise, as in the dominant theories of resistance, but of the most powerful and privileged to refuse to comply and engage in the work of glocal citizenship. In doing this, citizens in glocal networks are engaged in civicizing and democratizing these imperial relationships by bringing them under the shared authority of all those subject to them *in* their local places and ways. They can steer the negotiations into the civil, legal and political institutions of the most effective nation state or of global civil society, or they can negotiate directly in civic society, or they can pursue both strategies at once. If the negotiations take hold, the subaltern partner ceases to be 'dependent' but also does *not* become 'independent' (as was imagined in the unsuccessful theories of decolonization). Rather, the partners gradually become 'interdependent' on the ongoing democratic relationships between them.¹¹⁰ These innumerable practices of glocal negotiation and confrontation comprise one non-violent path of de-imperialization and democratization characteristic of the civic tradition.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ As we saw for the local examples in Subsection 5, aspect 7.

¹¹¹ See I. M. Young, *Global Challenges: War, Self-Determination and Responsibility for Justice*, Cambridge: Polity, 2007, especially pp. 137–9; and Tully, *Public Philosophy II*, chapter 4.

The second way glocal networks work to transform imperial relationships into democratic ones is through the spread of cooperative citizen relationships between partners in the North and Global South. These cooperative informal federations are not strategies of contestation and negotiation, but of directly acting otherwise: of creating non-violent civic relationships between partners in the North and the Global South. The relationships among all the partners in the network, and within each partner's local community association, are worked out civically and democratically as they go along.¹¹² Although there are thousands of examples, perhaps the best known are glocal cooperative 'fair trade' and self-reliance relationships, such as the specific Fair Trade and Level Ground cases, in contrast to competitive free trade; glocal networks of non-violent dispute resolution in contrast to war, militarization and securitization and deep ecology networks in contrast to (oxymoronic) sustainable development.¹¹³ Like their local cooperative partners, these glocal cooperative citizens work within the Spielraum of existing global rules in each case, yet they play a completely different game with different goods. They create and live 'another world' in their civic and glocal activities.¹¹⁴

The World Social Forum has emerged as an important place where civic and glocal citizens can meet each year. It is to glocal citizenship as the World Economic Forum is to modern citizenship. The forum does not take a position, but, rather, provides a civic space in which participants from diverse citizenship practices can enter into civic dialogues of translation, comparison, criticism, reciprocal learning and further networking. They share the knowledge of their different arts of citizenship with each other without granting modern citizenship the

¹¹² They build on the local coops of Subsection 5, aspect 11.

¹¹³ For fair trade and mutual aid as the antidote to free trade, see G. Dunkley, *Free Trade: Myth, Reality and Alternatives*, London: Zed Books, 2003. For examples see Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 8.

¹¹⁴ For a global survey see Hawken, *Blessed Unrest*, and his website of civicizing networks around the world at www.wiserearth.org; Grimes and Milgram, *Artisans and Cooperatives* and Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 8. For the primary importance of building webs of nurturing relationships among local ecologies, food producers, food consumers and waste recyclers, see Moran, *People and Nature*.

universal and superior status it claims for itself and on the presumption that each mode of citizenship is partial and incomplete, so each can learn its limitations from others. The forum also hopes to develop closer links of reciprocal learning between academic research and the practices of citizenship we have been discussing, perhaps setting up popular universities of the social movements for this purpose.¹¹⁵

Relationships of reciprocal elucidation between academic research and civic activists, of which the popular universities is only one example, bring into being yet another kind of glocal partnership. These are glocal pedagogical partnerships that aim to challenge the institutional separation between university education and its 'fields of study' that is characteristic of the modern university.¹¹⁶ They also challenge the current privatization and globalization of this institutional model of the university. Glocal pedagogical relationships aim to bring university learners, teachers and researchers into a more practical and mutually edifying relationship with the activists and activities studied, as well as to encourage universities to become good, responsible civic citizens of their own locales, sharing their knowledge with local communities and becoming exemplary glocal citizens. This is a civicizing revolution in the way we think of and practice higher education in relation to public affairs.¹¹⁷

Finally, all these examples illustrate one of the most fundamental practical advantages of a civic/glocal orientation. Many if not most of the global harms to public good we have discussed, from inequality, exploitation and war to climate change and global warming caused by imperial competition over scarce resources, cross the jurisdictional boundaries of the institutions of civil and cosmopolitan citizenship.

¹¹⁵ B. de Sousa Santos, *The Rise of the Global Left: The World Social Forum and Beyond*, London: Zed Books, 2006; J. Conway, 'Citizenship in a Time of Empire: The World Social Forum as a New Public Space', *Citizenship Studies* 8 (4): 367–81, 2004.

¹¹⁶ This particular institutional separation of university education is part of the more general modern trend discussed in Subsection 5, aspect 9.

¹¹⁷ M. R. M'Gonigle and J. Stark, *Planet U: Sustaining the World, Reinventing the University*, Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers, 2006; and Tully, *Public Philosophy* I, chapter 1 for this pedagogical relationship between academic research teams and civic citizens.

There is thus a series of disempowering ‘disjunctures’ between the agents who cause the harm and the people who are affected by them, for the agents responsible are often not subject to the jurisdiction of the civil institutions in which those affected have the status of civil citizens.¹¹⁸ This is a critical problem of civil citizenship organized within nation states and an international law system of formally equal yet substantively unequal and dependent nation states. It can be addressed within the civil tradition only by the establishment of something like a world state or its negative surrogate (an alliance of powerful states) to enforce the empire of rules of modern cosmopolitan citizenship and its underlying institutions. Yet, as we have seen, this further and perhaps ultimate projection of this imperial model would bring with it all the preconditions of the global harms in the first place.¹¹⁹ The civic tradition simply does not have this disenfranchising disjuncture problem. By starting from the premise that any community subject to and affected by a relationship of governance that harms a public good is for that very reason a citizenry with the civic right to hold the responsible party accountable through civic negotiations, it links democratic organization, networkization and civicized institutionalization directly to the specific power relationship at issue and at the most effective sites.

7. Conclusion: Exemplars

If all the millions of examples of civic and glocal citizenship practices could be taken in a single view, as the tradition of modern citizenship and globalization presents its inexorable progress, perhaps this would help to dissipate the sense of disempowerment and disenchantment the present crisis induces. But, from the situated standpoint of diverse

¹¹⁸ David Held introduced this ‘disjuncture’ problem (see Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapter 2).

¹¹⁹ For my objections to various plans to extend the imperial project, see Tully, *Public Philosophy* II, chapters 5, 7 and 8. For another example, see J. G. Ikenberry and A. Slaughter, *Forging a World of Liberty under Law: US National Security in the 21st Century*, The Princeton Project on National Security, The Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs: Princeton University, 2006.

citizenship, this cannot be done and the attempt would overlook the very diversity that the civic approach aims to disclose, keep in view, learn from and work with. Civic empowerment and enchantment do not come from grand narratives of universal progress but from *praxis* – actual participation in civic activities with others where we become the citizens we can be. But this response raises the question of the motive for participation in the first place. The civic answer has always been the motivating force of examples of civic activities and exemplars of civic citizenship. Since the civic tradition has no place for the cult of great leaders and leadership but only for citizens linking arms and working together in partnerships, it turns once again to everyday practice for these motivating stories.

Fortunately today there are over one million examples of civic and glocal networks and cooperatives and millions of exemplary ordinary citizens from all walks of life in all locales that move potential citizens of all ages to participate. They arguably make up the largest non-centralized and diverse movement of movements in the world.¹²⁰ But perhaps an illustrative exemplar for our dark times of the kind of glocal citizenship I have sketched is Mahatma Gandhi and his lifelong activities to rid the world of imperialism. His ordinary civic and glocal life continues to move millions of people to begin to act. The reason for this, I believe, is the simplicity of the four citizenship practices his life of *Satyagraha* manifests.¹²¹

The first is active non-cooperation vis-à-vis any imperial (non-civic) relationship and its corresponding idea of one universal civilization or cosmopolitanism for all. The second is the way of peace. For Gandhi this consists in civic organization and uncompromising non-violent confrontation and negotiation with those responsible for imperial relationships with the aim of converting them to non-violent, democratic and peaceful relationships. Third, for these two activities to be effective they have to be grounded in the local field and practices of the alternative

¹²⁰ Hawken, *Blessed Unrest*, makes this argument.

¹²¹ For Gandhi's life and influence, see T. Weber, *Gandhi as Disciple and Mentor*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

world you want to bring about. For Gandhi this consists of ‘constructive work’ in local, self-reliant, civically organized Indian villages and respectful participation in their ways. Like millions of glocal journeyers, Gandhi started from and returned home to the close and closest things after a sojourn in the transcendent world of modern citizenship, seeing these homespun activities in a new and enchanting light. ‘Where have I been?’ one often exclaims at this moment of insight and transformation into a citizen who sees, thinks and acts glocally.¹²² Fourth, the first three practices are integrated into a singular style of civic life by the more personal practices of self-awareness and self-formation.¹²³ For Gandhi these arts and exercises comprise a spiritual relationship to oneself in one’s relationships with others and the environing natural and spiritual worlds.¹²⁴ This is a meditative relationship of working truthfully on oneself and one’s attitude to improve how one conducts oneself in the challenging yet rewarding civic relationships with others. These are daily practices of becoming an exemplary citizen.

8. Afterword – The crisis of global citizenship: Civil and civic responses

The crisis of global citizenship

This afterword expands on the crisis of global citizenship and democratic deficit referred to in *On Global Citizenship*. The objective is to show more specifically how practices of civil and civic citizenship can be seen as democratic responses to the insufficiency of participation within the

¹²² A moving rendition of such a journey of self-discovery, which walks us through many of the steps of this chapter, was written by Nietzsche in Nice in the summer of 1886 when he was composing the life-affirming fifth book of the *Gay Science*. See F. Nietzsche, ‘Preface 1886’ in *Human, All too Human: A Book for Free Spirits*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986. For an analysis of experiences of transformation from subject to active citizen, see Norval, *Aversive Democracy*.

¹²³ For the place of practices of the self see Subsection 5.

¹²⁴ Similar practices are available in every culture. See D. Fontana, *The Meditator’s Handbook: A Complete Guide to Eastern and Western Meditation Techniques*, London: Thorsons, 1992.

institutions of modern civil citizenship. The afterword incorporates the main arguments in 'A Dilemma of Democratic Citizenship' referred to by the contributors, and some further arguments.¹²⁵ It thus provides a necessary background for understanding several of the arguments of the contributors and my responses to them.

The crisis of global citizenship refers to the difficulties citizens have in trying to respond effectively to the global problems outlined in *On Global Citizenship*. Let us take four local-and-global injustices as examples. These are: (1) the horrendous inequalities, poverty and exploitation of the Global South, and, increasingly in the Global North; (2) climate change and the destruction of the environment; (3) global wars, the militarization of conflicts and their collateral and blowback effects and (4) unjust forms of recognition and non-recognition.

These problems are interconnected. The historical processes of modernization, industrialization, Western expansion, exploitation of the world's resources and economic globalization that are the major cause of the ecological crisis are also the major cause of the inequalities between the Global North and South, and within the Global North. And, the primary role of the huge global military empire of the Great Powers is to protect and expand the very processes of economic globalization that are deeply implicated in the ecological and inequality problems. Moreover, the unjust forms of recognition of individuals, groups, peoples and civilizations are often closely related to their nonconformity to the institutions and processes of modern development.

Many social and ecological scientists argue that the apparent trend of these four complex processes is the gradual destruction of life on earth; through starvation, hunger and poverty; ever more destructive wars, war-preparation and their collateral effects; the destruction of biodiversity and the environment and greenhouse gases, global warming and massive climate change. From 1992 to the latest report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, over 1,000 climate scientists warn that, if humanity does not change this destructive way

¹²⁵ Also see J. Tully, 'The Crisis of Global Citizenship', *Radical Politics Today*, July 2009 at www.spaceofdemocracy.org.

of life, then the planet will become uninhabitable for most forms of life. This is called the Medea Hypothesis.¹²⁶

When citizens engage in the institutions of modern civil citizenship to address these problems, they find that the effective exercise of their democratic capabilities is limited. The ineffectiveness of and limitations on the exercise of global citizenship through official channels is a fifth injustice of our age. This ‘incapacitation’ of practices of democratic citizenship in response to local and global injustices is a global democratic deficit. My thesis is that the democratic deficit is a structural feature of the institutions of modern civil module and its four tiers of rights and duties.

As we have seen, the module limits democratic participation in the following ways. First, the anti-democratic ways it is spread around the world and the ways it limits or eliminates other forms of government and participation are unjust. Second, it limits participation to the exercise of communicative capacities in official public spheres and parties with the hope of influencing electors and representatives. Third, by placing the organization, exercise and development of the productive capacities of human beings in the private sphere, it shields them from ‘democratization’: that is, from bringing these social and economic activities under the democratic authority of those who are subject to them. This is done by placing the commodification of labour power and resources under the protection of the tier-one right of non-interference of individuals and corporations. Yet, these privatized activities are the major interconnected cause of the local-and-global problems citizens are trying to address. These three limits incapacitate citizens from addressing the global problems effectively and thus give rise to the crisis of global citizenship. From a democratic perspective, this could be called ‘the tragedy of privatization’ in contrast to the dominant thesis of the ‘tragedy of the commons’, which has served to legitimate the spread of the institutional structure of privatization and low-intensity democracy since Hobbes.

¹²⁶ T. Flannery, *Here on Earth: A Natural History of the Planet*, New York: Atlantic Monthly, 2010.

Reform from within: The civil and civic response

The first response to the crisis of global citizenship by both civil and civic citizens is to try to reform the institutions of participation from within. Theorists from Rousseau to Rawls argue that a necessary feature of a free society is that citizens not only participate within the institutional structure available to them, they must also be free to exchange public reasons over the justice or injustice of the basic institutional structure they have inherited. Accordingly, faced with the limits on participation and the tragedy of privatization, democratic citizens around the world enter into the official and unofficial public spheres, parties and reform movements within states, at the UN and institutions of global governance, and through the human rights available in International Law, and seek to bring this diagnosis to the attention of fellow citizens and elected officials. These are the practices of 'democratizing democracy' mentioned in *On Global Citizenship*.

Many important reforms have been achieved: the extension of the franchise, feminist movements, the struggles for social and economic rights by labour organizations, struggles for minority rights and the recognition of indigenous peoples, the demands for legal and political pluralism, the formation of green parties, rights to clean water and environmental protection, initiatives to improve representation at the UN and institutions of global governance and struggles to make local, national and global public spheres and governments more inclusive, proportional and pluralistic.

Yet, the institutional limits on democratic participation and in relation to privatization are so powerful in law, practice and modern theories of negative freedom that it is exceptionally difficult even to regulate economic activities to some modest extent through the official channels of public deliberation, representative government and legislation, as we have seen again in the financial crisis and responses to it.

Elected officials are dependent on corporate campaign funding; governments are dependent on corporate taxes; access, voice and communicative power in public reasoning are radically unequal and

powerful corporations and ministries are able to influence legislation and exert control over the framing of issues in public spheres and over the ‘influence power’ public deliberations are said to have. Powerful multinational corporations can hide behind their tier-one rights, bypass or bribe impoverished local governments, intimidate sweat-shop workers, influence the institutions of global governance and invoke transnational trade laws that protect free trade from democratic scrutiny. Finally, while the free press and media that accompany the spread of the basic institutions *can* assist public reasoning, they can also come under the hegemony of concentrations of private, government and military power beyond the reach of democratic participation.¹²⁷

Four civic responses

When civic citizens run up against the limits of reform they turn to practices of cooperative citizenship. They begin to extend practices of citizen participation beyond the reforms of the official spheres of representative democracy. They do so in a multiplicity of ways. I would like to sketch four practices of cooperative citizenship that are responses to the crisis of global citizenship. In the theories of modern representative government, these citizens are said to have conditionally delegated their capacities of self-government to their representatives and to have retained only the communicative capacities they exercise in voting and exchanging public reasons in public spheres. In each of the types of cooperative citizenship, they re-appropriate these capabilities of self-organization and self-government and exercise them directly in concert. In so doing, cooperative citizens are revolutionary in weaving together as tightly as possible speaking together and acting together as citizens – public reasoning and public acting. This re-integration

¹²⁷ See J. Tully, ‘On the Multiplicity of Global Public Spheres’, in C. Emden and D. Midgley, eds, *Beyond Habermas: Democracy, Knowledge and the Public Sphere*, New York: Berghahn Books, 2012; Also the other chapters in this volume. For the limits to reform from within I am deeply indebted to the work by Michael M’Gonigle from a green legal perspective. In particular, see the devastating critique of M. R. M’Gonigle and L. Takeda, ‘The Liberal Limits of Environmental Law: A Green Legal Critique’, *Pace Environmental Law Review*, 30, 2013.

of the capacities of self-government is literally impossible within the institutions of modern representative democracy. They are designed to dis-embed these capabilities from situated practices and differentiate their exercise into separate spheres.

Practices of negotiation

The first re-appropriation is to take back the democratic capacities of negotiating with the actors who they believe are responsible for the global problems. These are the negotiation capabilities that are delegated to legislatures and courts in the representative module. These citizens organize democratic negotiation networks locally and globally around a specific activity that is argued to be a cause of inequality and exploitation, environmental damage, militarization and authoritarian rule. They then use non-violent networks of public education, persuasion and pressure to bring the powers-that-be to the negotiating table, whether this is an official table or an ad hoc table, as I outline in *On Global Citizenship*.¹²⁸ These arts have been developed in response to the failure of institutional reform: that is, as states, political parties and global institutions promoted neoliberal globalization and coercive structural adjustment, and ignored the democratic protests of the millions of people subject to these policies. These kinds of activities bring the actor in question to the negotiation table and to democratic practices of arguing and bargaining, alternative dispute resolution and methods of transformative justice.

Notice that these democratic practices of negotiation are closely related to the movements for reform of the official institutions. For, the moment a reform movement calls into question a limit on official participation and seeks to change it through unofficial forms of protest, boycott and negotiation, it is beginning to engage in this civic kind of negotiation as well. The great reforms of the institutional structures of modern states and international law by women, labour movements, minorities, immigrants, community-based organizations

¹²⁸ Tully, *On Global Citizenship*.

and indigenous peoples are often examples of this type of democratic citizenship – combining civil and cooperative.¹²⁹

Practices of social and economic cooperation

In the next two types of civic citizenship citizens extend the practices of democratic participation into the private economic sphere: into the activities of resource extraction, production, distribution, consumption and recycling that underlie the tragedy of privatization. They do this by re-appropriating their capacities of social and economic organization and exercise them in common. One way to see the participatory practices of cooperative citizenship in this light is through the analysis of the privatization tragedy first given by Karl Polanyi and continued in the recent work on alternative globalization from below and reclaiming the commons. I did not see cooperative citizenship in the light of Polanyi's analysis when I wrote *On Global Citizenship*. I hope this perspective shows more clearly and specifically how civic practices of cooperation are effective responses to two structural features of the crisis of global citizenship.

Polanyi diagnosed the way that the private sphere was constructed in modern societies in the nineteenth century so as to place limits on democratic participation in the economic sphere. He argued that these limits were unique to nineteenth-century capitalist markets in contrast to all other forms of markets he studied. He singled out two unjustified and destructive limits in particular.¹³⁰

The first limit according to Polanyi is to privatize the producing and consuming capabilities of humans as if they were commodities like any other. This kind of commodification dis-embeds the producing and consuming capabilities and activities from the surrounding social relationships in which they take place and re-embeds them in abstract,

¹²⁹ See, for example, de Sousa Santos, *Democratizing Democracy*.

¹³⁰ K. Polanyi, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, Boston: Beacon, 2004. Three unjustifiable limits or fictitious commodities are set out in chapter 6, 'The Self-regulating Market and the Fictitious Commodities: Labour, Land and Money'. I do not discuss money here. For a contemporary restatement of his thesis, see P. Evans, 'Is an Alternative Globalization Possible?', *Politics and Society* 36 (2): 271–305, 2008.

competitive and non-democratic global market relationships. The surrounding social relationships in which producers and consumers live are treated as externalities. As a result, the exercise of human capabilities in these abstract and competitive economic and legal relationships gradually undercuts the webs of interdependent social relationships and social capital on which humans depend for their well-being.

The remedy to this injustice is not only to exchange public reasons in hopes of influencing governments, for this has its limits. For cooperative democrats, the response is to non-cooperate with this undemocratic mode of production and consumption, to withdraw one's producing and consuming capabilities from commodification and to exercise productive and consumptive capabilities 'in common' in democratically run cooperatives and community-based organizations that are re-embedded in social relationships. Such grass roots democracies then produce and distribute the basic public goods that are privatized under the dominant form of democracy: food, shelter, clothing, health care, clean water, security and so on. These social and economic democracies are linked together by global networks of fair trade relationships that are also under the democratic control of the producers and consumers subject to them. This famous response to the injustices of the privatization of labour power gave rise to the tradition of cooperative democracy throughout the world. From Robert Owen, William Thompson and Peter Kropotkin in Europe, to Gandhi, Schumacher and the Swaraj and Swadeshi movements across Asia and Africa, to food sovereignty in Latin America, the turn to local food production, microcredit, democratic cooperatives and indigenous and non-indigenous community-based organizations of diverse scales and types, these are linked together by global networks of fair trade and self-reliance.¹³¹

These cooperative practices generate social capital and realize social and economic justice directly by bringing the local and global organization of economic activities under the democratic cooperation

¹³¹ J. Restakis, *Humanizing the Economy: Co-operatives in the Age of Capital*, Gabriola Island: New Society, 2010.

and mutual aid of all subject to and affected by them. This is the cooperative citizenship response to the global problem of economic inequality and exploitation. It is important to note that despite the global spread of the institutional module of modern representative government and civil citizenship, poverty and hunger persist:

963 million people go to bed hungry every night. One billion people live in slums. One woman dies every minute in childbirth. 2.5 billion people have no access to adequate sanitation services and 20,000 children a day die as a result.¹³²

Cooperative democrats offer a response to this global injustice that is more immediate and perhaps more lasting than representative responses because the victims of hunger, starvation and poverty become the agents of grass roots democracy and economic self-reliance.

Practices of ecological cooperation

The second unjust and destructive limit according to Polanyi is the privatization of land and natural resources as if they are commodities like any other commodity. Yet, he argues, natural resources are not commodities like any other. This global enclosure of natural resources and biological diversity dis-embeds natural resources from the interdependent ecological relationships in which all forms of life live and breathe and have their modes of being; and it re-embeds them in abstract and competitive global market relations of development. The enveloping ecological relationships are then treated as externalities. The result of 'development' under this privatized system is the destruction of the webs of interdependent ecological relationships that make up and sustain the natural and human world, giving rise to the environmental crisis and climate change. This form of privatized development gradually eats away the ecological relationships or ecological capital on which life on earth depends.

¹³² I. Kahn, *The Unheard Truth: Poverty and Human Rights*, New York: W.W. Norton, 2010.

The response to this injustice by actors in the cooperative tradition is to withdraw their capacities from activities based on the commodification of the environment and to develop a responsible way of relating in and to it. They re-embed natural resources and their use by humans into their place within ecological relationships. Following Albert Schweitzer, they see the webs of ecological relationships as a 'living commonwealth of all forms of life'. They derive the fundamental duties and rights of democracy in the first instance from their membership in the webs of ecological relationships in which democracy takes place and on which all forms of life depend. This natural gift economy is for them the true mother of democracy. The norms of ecological well-being govern economics, not the other way round. They are Gaia citizens.¹³³

This revolutionary response to the injustice of privatization of the natural world has given rise to the great cooperative and community-based ecology movements. From Aldo Leopold, Rachel Carson and Vandana Shiva to the Chipko Movement in India and Asia, and on to Japanese fishing cooperatives, the water justice movement, Food Sovereignty and everyday ecological footprint initiatives, millions of Gaia citizens are reclaiming the commons and exercising their capabilities democratically in ethical relationships of stewardship in the commonwealth of all forms of life. These experiments in eco-democracy are responses and alternatives to the idea of development that gives rise to the tragedy of privatization and the environmental crisis.¹³⁴

As we have seen, the two premises that underlie the institutions of modern civil citizenship are that humans are naturally antagonistic and thus that they need an authoritarian master who coercively imposes a structure of law over them as a socializing precondition of peace and democracy. These are the two premises of processes of civilization and modernization.¹³⁵ As we can also see, civic citizens reject these

¹³³ Tully, *On Global Citizenship*.

¹³⁴ See, for example, Shiva, *Earth Democracy*, and earlier, E. F. Schumacher, *Small Is Beautiful: A Study of Economics as if People Mattered*, Tiptree Essex: Anchor, 1973.

¹³⁵ For the rise of these two modern premises, see T. Todorov, *Life in Common: An Essay in General Anthropology*, translated by K. Golsan and L. Golsan, London: University of Nebraska Press, 2000.

premises. They argue that humans are basically self-organizing and self-governing beings. Autopoiesis – self-organization, cooperation and non-violent contestation and dispute resolution – are more basic conditions of human evolution than violent conflict and command relationships.¹³⁶ If this were not the case, if Kantian antagonism and Hobbesian war of all against all were primary, the human species would have perished long ago. We overlook this pacific feature of our everyday activities precisely because it is so commonplace and familiar.¹³⁷ Humans are not unique in this respect. The hypothesis holds for all forms of life and for the ecological relationships in which they all live. This was put on scientific footing in the 1960s by Sir James Lovelock and given the names Gaia hypothesis and Gaia theory in the 1970s. It is widely endorsed by biological, ecological and climate scientists today.¹³⁸ This view that the ground of our being as earthlings is relationships of mutual interdependence and support – of biophilia or love – is also widely endorsed by many of the spiritual traditions of the world. This helps to explain the powerful attraction of cooperative citizenship to people from such different secular and spiritual traditions. Cooperative citizens, one might say, act in and for the love of the world.¹³⁹

Practices of non-violent ethics and agonistics

Cooperative citizenship is the manifestation of a distinctive ethical norm: citizens should ‘be the change’. To be citizens, citizens should embody in their everyday activities the change they wish to see in

¹³⁶ For example, this cooperative working hypothesis was put forward by Johann Herder in response to Kant, Peter Kropotkin in response to T. H. Huxley’s interpretation of Darwin and Ashley Montagu during the Cold War. For a comprehensive restatement of it, see E. Thompson, *Mind in Life: Biology, Phenomenology and the Sciences of Mind*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.

¹³⁷ M. K. Gandhi, *Gandhi: Hind Swaraj and Other Writings*, A. Parel, ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, 88–99.

¹³⁸ J. Lovelock, *Gaia and the Theory of the Living Planet*, London: Gaia Books, 2005. For an introduction to Lovelock’s theory in relation to other traditions of thought, see S. Harding, *Animate Earth: Science, Intuition and Gaia*, White River Junction Vermont: Chelsea Green, 2006.

¹³⁹ See, for example, Dalai Lama, *Beyond Religion: Ethics for a Whole World*, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 2011. Eric Fromm introduced the widely-used term ‘biophilia’ in 1956.

the larger society and argue for in the public sphere. It is not enough to present arguments in the public sphere in hopes of influencing voters and governments, and on the assumption that it is the role of government to bring about the corresponding change. It is also necessary ethically to practice what one preaches in one's conduct: to perform the duties that bring about the results one advocates. If you argue publicly for democracy, then act democratically in relationships with others, always relating to them as co-agents, never as things to be unilaterally commanded or killed. That is, relationships of power and governance in any sphere should always be open to the ongoing questioning, negotiation and transformation of those who are subject to and affected by them: if you advocate a stewardship relationship to the environment, then care for the environment in your everyday activities; if you argue for democratic and egalitarian relationships between the Global North and South, then enter only into this kind of negotiated and fair trade relationship and refuse unequal and non-democratic free trade relationships; if you argue for just forms of recognition then recognize and relate to others accordingly in your everyday activities and if you argue publicly for world peace, then act peacefully in every breath and step you take and refuse to support violent relationships.¹⁴⁰

The result of enacting this ethical norm is that cooperative citizens begin to bring the other world of change into being here and now, step by ethical step. This is the meaning of grass roots democracy or democratic-globalization from below. It is the way to bring about radical and lasting change. On this civic view, the great changes in the ethico-political conduct of citizens are what move governments to end slavery, enfranchise women, enact environmental legislation, end unjust wars, adopt effective human rights, support economic self-reliance and self-government and pass climate change legislation.

¹⁴⁰ For example, see T. Nhat Hahn, *Peace is Every Step: The Path of Mindfulness in Everyday Life*, New York: Bantam Books, 1992. For a defence of this way of thinking about ethics as ethos, in contrast to deontology and utilitarianism, see P. Curry, *Ecological Ethics: An Introduction*, Cambridge: Polity, 2011.

The ethical norm of being the change is also the expression of the organic relationship between means and ends. For cooperative citizens, means and ends are internally related, like a seed to the full-grown plant, as Gandhi put it.¹⁴¹ They are pre-figurative or constitutive of ends. Consequently, democratic and peaceful relationships among humans are brought about by democratic and non-violent means. Conversely, the means of violence and command relationships do not bring about peace and democracy. They too are constitutive means. They bring about security dilemmas and the spiral of the command relations necessary for war preparation, arms races and more violence. Democracy and peace, on this civic view, do not grow out of the barrel of a gun or the imperatives of an authoritarian government, but despite and in the interstices of their presence.¹⁴²

These three ethical, existential and social scientific arguments for the primacy of democratic and non-violent ways of being in the world bring us to the fourth example of cooperative citizenship, the democratic, non-violent movements of the last 150 years. Their aim is to replace the power politics of violence and command with the global politics of non-violence and negotiated relationships of civic and civil freedom. Although these three arguments were well-developed and widely supported by the early twentieth century, the peace movements lacked a substitute or equivalent for war and violence as the means to settle disputes among and within states and to bring about regime change.¹⁴³ These arguments seemed to lead to non-resistance or pacifism.

The revolutionary solution to this problem came from the life-long practice and writing of Mohandas Gandhi. He developed a whole repertoire of very active non-violent, agonistic arts for confronting and transforming the most powerful empire in the world (the British

¹⁴¹ M. K. Gandhi, *The Essential Writings*, J. Brown, ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008, p. 58.

¹⁴² H. Arendt, *On Violence*, New York: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1970. The most systematic treatment of violent and non-violent means and ends is J. V. Bondurant, *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

¹⁴³ W. James, 'The Moral Equivalent of War', *McClure's Magazine* 35: 463–68, 1910. For the background to James's challenge to the peace movement, see Kurlansky, *Nonviolence*.

Empire in India) and for constructing non-violent collective self-government (swaraj) and economic self-government (swadeshi).¹⁴⁴ These obstructive and constructive arts of non-violent self-government reach from individual and local self-government to global federalism. The aim of non-violent agonistics of confrontation and negotiation is neither to defeat the enemy and impose an institutional structure over them nor to bring an end to conflict and contestation over justice and recognition. Rather, it is to convert the adversary to non-violent and creative ways of negotiating and overcoming differences, on the one hand, and to transform the relationship between adversaries to a democratic one that is open to this kind of ongoing negotiation, on the other. It is to integrate all the energy expended in violent conflict into a non-violent search for creative solutions that the partners cannot even begin to see until they enter into the inter-subjective space of the critical exchange of words and deeds over the injustice in question between them. The revolutionary arts of non-violent self-government and citizenship are less than 100 years old. Yet, they are now used around the world, tested and improved in practice and theory, and new techniques added to the repertoire. As a result, practitioners and social scientists are beginning to appreciate the transformative power of participatory non-violence and the futility of war in comparison.¹⁴⁵

Joining hands and working together

I began by mentioning how civil and civic citizens work together to reform the institutions of representative government and global governance from within. I now wish to suggest the ways in which civil and civic reform movements within and the four practices of cooperative citizenship without can join hands, work in mutually supportive ways and change the world. I did not see these connections when I was working on *On Global Citizenship* and *A Dilemma of Global*

¹⁴⁴ M. K. Gandhi, *Nonviolent Resistance* (Satyagraha), Boston: Schocken, 1961.

¹⁴⁵ I discuss the techniques of non-violent agonistics and participatory democracy in my responses to the contributors. For a general introduction, see Ackerman and DuVall, *A Force More Powerful*.

Citizenship. The connections between the two traditions of citizenship were the dilemma that remained unanswered. However, when I began to study the civil research of Amartya Sen and the civic and cooperative research of Elinor Ostrom, the connections of complementarity became obvious.¹⁴⁶

First, by 'being the change', cooperative citizens put into practice the arguments for democracy and justice that deliberative democrats argue for in the public sphere. They realize in their everyday activities the ideals that the democratic reformers share.

Next, cooperative democrats benefit from robust and responsive public spheres and discussion-based governments that are open to and supportive of their concrete experiments in making another world of democracy actual. Reciprocally, to be able to hear and understand the voices of the oppressed, to be able to scrutinize the various responses and counter-responses and to be able to advance comparative and effective recommendations in public reasoning, reform-minded civil democrats need to have the experiential knowledge of living democratically that participation in local cooperative democracies can provide. Democratic knowledge is practical knowledge: acquired in practice, studied in academic research and returned to practice for testing.¹⁴⁷

Similarly, academic researchers in both traditions can also join hands and work together. They need to find ways to work more closely with citizens engaged in practices of democratic citizenship of both types. This form of research is based on the realization that practices of democratic citizenship are epistemic communities in their own right and from which they can learn. This is a way to overcome the tendency to approach these forms of citizenship with the conceptual frameworks of citizenship that developed along with the dominant institutional structure, and thus to discount, obscure and misrecognize alternative

¹⁴⁶ See J. Tully, 'Two Ways of Realizing Justice and Democracy: Linking Amartya Sen and Elinor Ostrom', *Critical Review of Social and Political Philosophy* 16 (2): 220–32, 2012. For a complementary analysis in Latin America, see A. Escobar, 'Latin America at a Crossroads', *Cultural Studies* 24 (1): 1–65, 2010.

¹⁴⁷ For an example, see C. Barlow, *Blue Covenant: The Global Water Crisis and the Coming Battle for the Right to Water*, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 2007.

practices of citizenship. Just as researchers can learn from democratic practices of citizenship, cooperative citizens have much to learn from academic research. Thus, relationships between research communities and citizenship communities can also be relationships of reciprocal support and enlightenment.

Last but not least, civil democrats need the mutual aid of cooperative democracy whenever they run up against the limits of public reasoning with an unjust government and whenever a whole people are told that they require authoritarian rule until they are ‘ready for democracy’. Rather than turning to self-defeating violent means, reform democrats require the existing social capital and non-violent democratic skills of cooperative democrats to organize protests and widespread non-cooperation to move the unjust government to negotiate or to undermine its authority and to build a more democratic one from the ground up. This is the lesson of Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr and the non-violent democratic social organizations in the Egyptian revolution in 2011. It may be the lesson of every successful non-violent revolution of and for democracy in our time.¹⁴⁸

The life of Gandhi provides an example of how these two modes of citizenship can complement each other. As a representative democrat he supported the Congress Party and representative government, and he reasoned and negotiated endlessly in the official public spheres available to him.¹⁴⁹ Yet, he also grounded himself in cooperative citizenship practices of non-violent agonistics and regime change, and in alternative practices of social, economic and ecological self-government. He organized movements of non-cooperation with rule,, organized self-reliant and self-governing ashrams and worked with self-reliant villages. Furthermore, he also engaged in daily spiritual practices of cultivating non-violent relationships to oneself, other living beings and the spiritual realm. Finally, he also saw all these practices as

¹⁴⁸ For the example of the non-violent Egyptian revolution of 2011, see J. Tully, ‘Middle East Legal and Governmental Pluralism: A View of the Field from the Demos’, *Middle East Law and Governance*, 4: 1–39, 2012.

¹⁴⁹ This did not stop Gandhi from writing a thoroughgoing criticism of the British system of representative government in *Hind Swaraj*.

‘experiments in truth’ that enabled him to test and revise his modes of civil and civic citizenship as he went along. In concert, these practices realize a comprehensive way of life he called Satyagraha (soul power). It consists in striving to be truthful to the ground of being in everything we say and do. And the ground of our being is relationships of ahimsa (non-violence or love).¹⁵⁰

¹⁵⁰ For an excellent selection of Gandhi’s writings on this theme, see T. Merton, ed., *Gandhi on Non-violence*, New York: New Directions, 2007. For an introduction to recent scholarship on Gandhi, see J. M. Brown and A. Parel, eds, *The Cambridge Companion to Gandhi*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.